00068067

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 17 February, 2016

SEQUEL

TO

LETTERS TO M. GONDON,

ON THE

DESTRUCTIVE CHARACTER

OF THE

Church of Rome,

6 E 067
oe

BOTH IN RELIGION AND POLITY.

Vol. II

BY

CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D.

CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

A. d. 25

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1848.

282
W101/C97
68067

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

CONTENTS

OF THE

SEQUEL TO THE LETTERS TO M. GONDON.

LETTER I. Page 1.

PAGE

Occasion of the present Sequel to "Letters to M. Gondon" . 1
Its Nature and Design . . . . . 2—4

LETTER II. Page 5.

Animadversions of three Periodicals—The *Tablet*, The *Dublin Review*, and The *British Magazine*, on the use made in the Letters of a passage from Cardinal Bellarmine's work, "On the Pope" . . . . . 6—10
Discrepancy between the three Reviewers and Cardinal Bellarmine himself 10
Bellarmine inculcates implicit obedience to the Papacy . 11—14
Consequences of this doctrine 13
Character of Bellarmine's writings 14
Illustration of Bellarmine's doctrine of Implicit Obedience . 15
Lælius and C. Blossius . . . . . ib.
Gracchus and the Pope: Blossius and Bellarmine . . 15—20
Whether the Pope ever commands *vices* . . . . . 17—19
Case of Pius V. canonized as a Saint by Rome; his acts . 17, 18
Pius V. chosen as a model and a patron Saint by the present Pontiff, Pius IX. 17, 18
When the Pope commanded vices, what was the conduct and teaching of Cardinal Bellarmine 19

PAGE
Reply to this question by a reference to French and English History . . . . . 19—22
The Arch-priest Blackwell 20
Romish Bishops in England . . . . . ib.
Oath of Allegiance . . . . . 19—22
Bishop Andrewes 21, 22
Suggestion to a Reviewer 23, 24
By whom is the passage of Bellarmine, concerning Implicit Obedience, quoted and illustrated . . . . . 24—39
Ames 24
Sir Humphrey Lynde . . . . . ib.
Henry Foulis 27
Dr. Potter 30
Dr. Crakanthorpe 33
Bishop Sanderson 34
Bishop Barlow 36
Rev. Joseph Mendham 39
The Jesuit Gretser . . . . . ib.
Services of the English Universities to the cause of Loyalty and Religion 40
"Christian Liberalism" 41
Alliance of the Papacy with Democracy . . . . . ib.
Whether the Pope can be regarded as a champion of Liberty 18. 41

LETTER III. Page 42.

Letter from the General of the Jesuits concerning his Order and the Pope 4
Relations of the Jesuits to the Pope . . . . . ib. 22
Do the Constitutions of the Jesuits authorize sin? 4
Observations of the *British Magazine* and the *Dublin Review*, on a passage of the Constitutions . . . . . 43—48
These observations considered . . . . . 48—52
Stephen Pasquier 52
Digression concerning the political principles of the Jesuits with respect to civil *Allegiance* . . . . . ib.
Jesuit doctrines on Civil Governments coincide with *Jacobinical* . . . . . 52—6

PAGE
Doctrine and practice of the Jesuits, with regard to Kings and Kingly authority 55, 56
Fate of Henry III. and Henry IV. of France . . . 55, 57
Contrast of their policy with that of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. 56
Revival of Jesuitical political doctrines in France at this day, 56, 57
Mariana and Acquaviva . . . . . 57, 58—61
M. Ranke, on the anti-monarchical principles and practice of the Jesuits . . . Sovereignty of the *People* . . . 58—62
M. Pasquier's interpretation of the above-mentioned passage in the Constitutions 62
M. Ranke's observations on the same passage . . . 63, 64
Further Considerations and Remarks on this passage . . 65
Attempts of the Jesuits to render Sin sinless 66
Doctrines of Probability, and of Philosophical Sin . . . 67
The Superior may absolve from all Sin 68
Plea concerning startling Propositions 68, 69
Corollaries from the Reviewer's translation . . . 70—73
What the Jesuits and the World ought to expect from the Papacy 73, 74

LETTER IV. Page 75.

Isaac Casaubon, on the conduct of the Church of Rome towards Scripture 75
The Church of Rome dishonours Scripture in *seven* different ways 76
Disparaging and profane expressions of eminent Romanist Divines concerning Scripture 77
Apology of the Dublin Review for these expressions . . 78—80
Albert Pighius 81
Cardinal Hosius 81, 82
Ludovicus 82
Passages concerning Scripture, contrasted with Scripture itself, from Albert Pighius . . . . . 83—87
Passages from Ludovicus, similarly contrasted with Scripture 88—90
Passages from Cardinal Hosius concerning Scripture . 91—100
Bishop Jewell 92
The two false principles in the works of Hosius . . 94—96

PAGE
Demonstrated by examples . . . . . 96—99
Hosius and Laocoon 95
The Collier's Faith 100
Indignant Complaints of Hosius, concerning the conduct of Rome towards the Fathers of the Church . . 101—104
The Sins of Rome against Holy Scripture 104, 105
To be repented of and forsaken: not to be defended . 105, 106

LETTER V. Page 107.

On the denial of the cup to all but the consecrating Priest in the Holy Communion 107
Her own *custom* for the time being is the *only Law* of Rome; it destroys all other Law . . . . . 107—109
Council of Constance . . . . . 108—110
Pretexts for its decree 109, 110
Rome and the Pharisees 109
Apology of the Dublin Reviewer for Half Communion, and for the words of Cardinal Hosius respecting the Church of Rome enforcing it . . . . . 110—112
Remarks upon it . . . . . 112—114
In what spirit the Cup is withheld 113, 114
Remarks on the plea of the Church of Rome for the denial of the Cup 115
Cardinal Cusanus . . . . . ib.
The manifestos of the Cardinal as Papal Legate to the Bohemians . . . . . 115—123
He propounds the "*Doctrine of Development*" (the true theory of Romanism) in all its fulness 116
Proofs of this . . . . . 117—122
Scripture made by Rome to change its sense with the changes of Rome . . . . . 117—121
What becomes of the Word of God through the teaching of her Divines, as shown by the Decree of Constance and its advocates 123
Appeal to all reasonable and reflecting members of the Church of Rome . . . . . 123—125

LETTER VI. Page 126.

PAGE

On the words of Pope Gelasius, concerning Half Communion 126, 127
Allegations of the Dublin Reviewer 127
Remarks upon them . . . . . 128—132
A false title and a viperine gloss 130
Gratian: corruptions in, by glosses, and falsifications . 130—139
How the Church of Rome treats her own orthodox Popes 130—132
Manichæan intruders at the Holy Communion . . 132, 133
Cardinal Baronius . . . . . 131—138
How the Church of Rome is condemned by the Catholic Church . . . . . 136—138
Cardinal Bona 138
Contradiction between Roman Divines and Roman Councils 131—140
Rome anathematizes her own Popes 141
S. Ambrose and S. Augustine falsified 139, 140
Rome corrupts the works of her own Popes 141
The Council of Trent inconsistent with that of Constance . 142
Rome condemned by her own Popes . . . . . ib.
What Gelasius would have said concerning the present practice of Rome . . . . . ib.
Dilemma in which Rome is 142, 143

LETTER VII. Page 143.

Whether Rome keeps faith with those whom she calls heretics . 144
Decree of Council of Constance on this subject . . . ib.
Assertions of the Dublin Review . . . . . ib.
John Huss 145
His "Safe-conduct" to and from Constance 146
His imprisonment, sentence, and death 147
Sigismund 147, 148
First Decree of Constance, concerning Safe-conducts . . 149
Second Decree 152
These Decrees affirm that Faith is not to be kept with so-called Heretics, to the supposed prejudice of the Church of Rome 149—153
The *Tablet* and the *Dublin Review* 153, 154

PAGE
Proofs of the teaching of Rome, that "Faith is not to be kept with Heretics to the prejudice of the Church of Rome" . 155
Albert Pighius . . . . . ib.
Cardinal Hosius . . . . . ib.
Simanca . . . . . ib.
The Pope 156
How the Council of Trent understood the Decrees of Constance 157
Guilt of Rome in this matter 158
How she undermines the foundations of Government . 158, 159
What is to be expected from acts of conciliation on the part of Governments towards Rome 159
Examples: Henry III. and Henry IV. of France . . . 160
Contrasted with Queen Elizabeth . . . . . ib.
How Rome destroys the good name of Governors . . 160—163
Examples 161
What may be apprehended for England appealing for aid to the Court of Rome . . . . . 162—164

LETTER VIII. Page 165.

The Bishop of Rome destroys the Order and Jurisdiction of all other Bishops . . . . . 165—169
Pope Gregory the First's prophecy 165
Quotation from the Pontifical 167
"Chrisma conficere" . . . . . 167—169
Bulla in Cœnâ Domini 169
Case of Pius VII. and Napoleon . . . . . 170—178
The Pope's claim to a deposing power not obsolete . . . 170
The Oath of Allegiance to the French Republic . . . 171
The Pope's journey to Paris to crown Napoleon . . 171—173
The Archbishop of Paris concerning Napoleon's Coronation . 177
Practical inferences from that Coronation 179
Judging from the past, what we are to expect from Rome for the future . . . . . 179—180

LETTER IX. Page 181.

Concerning the *Hungarian Confession* 181
Extract from the Dublin Review 182

PAGE
Genuflexio major 183
Mariolatry . . . . . ib.
The Jesuits . . . . . 184—186
English Translation of the *Hungarian Confession*, with parallel passages . . . . . 186—192
Pope's Supremacy 186
Pope's Infallibility . . . . . ib.
Pope's power of absolution and excommunication . . . ib.
Popes add to Scripture . . . . . 187—189
Honour paid to Popes 187
Heretics, so called by Rome, to be burnt . . . 188—193
The reading of Scripture called the origin of heresy . 188—190
Invocation of Saints 188
Power of Romish Priests . . . . . ib.
Half-Communion . . . . . 189—195
Whole Communion called heretical 189
Transubstantiation 189
The Blessed Virgin more honoured by some in the Church of Rome than her Divine Son . . . . . 190—211
Imprecations on Parents 190
Scripture not to be commonly read by Romish laity . 188—191
What Inquisitors do, when Scripture is quoted . . . 193
History of the Confession . . . . . 193—212
Symbolical Books of Rome 195
Converts to Rome in the 17th and 18th centuries . . . 200
Hungary 201
Maurice William 203
Samuel Haller 204
The *Silesian Confession* . . . . . 208—210
Inferences from the Hungarian Confession 213
Pope Pius Fourth's Creed 214
Duty of Roman Catholics . . . . . ib.

LETTER X. Page 217.

Bp. Bull on Romish Mariolatry 217
Dublin Reviewer on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception 218
His analogy between belief in that doctrine and belief of Enoch's exemption from death . . . . . ib.

PAGE
How that doctrine affects the doctrine of Original Sin . 219—222
Examination of the Reviewer's alleged parallel . . . 223, 224
Sinfulness of Rome in propounding this doctrine, considered with respect to the Divine Being, to Holy Scripture, to the Church, and to the Blessed Virgin 225, 226
Consequent danger in following the teaching of Rome . . 227
Postscript . . . . . ib.
Father Perrone 228
His Dissertation on the Immaculate Conception . . . ib.
Letter of Pius IX. 229
The Pope desires that the Worship of the Virgin may be extended . . . . . ib.
Eulogizes the Jesuits for political as well as religious services . ib.

LETTER XI. Page 231.

What is the position of English Romanists; particularly of those who fall away from the Church of England to that of Rome . . . . . 231—233
Who the Author is of what still remains of good in the Romish Communion 232
Mistake in imagining this good to be derived from what is peculiar to Rome 233
Positive good in the English Communion; peculiar to it . . 232
This good not rightly appreciated by some . . . . . ib.
Ingratitude to God, followed by irreverence in temper and language . . . . . ib.
And punished by withdrawal of the Holy Spirit . . . 233
And by consequent judicial blindness, with respect to *evil* and to *good* . . . . . ib.
True use to be made of offences in the visible Church . . 234
Course and issue of perversion to Romanism . . . . . ib.
What the present condition of Rome is 235
How she is guilty of schism 236
If her Priesthood were to abjure the twelve new Articles of Pius the Fourth's Creed, *they* would not be guilty of schism: she *is* guilty of it, in *imposing* these articles 237
Case of *English* Romanists . . . . . ib.
How *they* are guilty of schism . . . . . ib.

PAGE
Schism is "contra caritatem" 238
Nothing profits without charity . . . . . ib.
Objection of the Dublin Reviewer . . . . . ib.
What is meant by "*leaving* a Communion" 239
Case of the excommunicated man, who was born blind . . ib.
In what respects Rome excommunicates herself . . . 240
Mixed state of the visible Church 241
Duty of patience and unity . . . . . ib.
Nature of the English Reformation 242
How the Church of England has maintained unity . . . ib.
Appeal to English Romanists . . . . . ib.
Appeal to foreign Roman Catholics 244
Their double duty at this time . . . . . ib.
The Catholic Church is the mystical Body of Christ . . 246
The Church of Rome is not the Catholic Church . . . ib.
But it is a very corrupt part of it . . . . . ib.
Whether the Pope is Antichrist . . . . . ib.
What the word Antichrist means . . . . . ib.
How the Pope sets himself (1) in the place of Christ, (2) in opposition to Christ: and thus acts in an Antichristian manner 247, 248
How he resembles the "Lawless One" 248
How Rome appears to be the seat of Antichrist . . . ib.
How still by the Divine long suffering to her, she yet retains certain main articles of Christianity; and so far is rightly called a Church, though a very corrupt one 249
Parallel case of the Church of Israel . . . . . ib.
Doctrine of English Divines (Hooker, Bp. Andrewes) and of the Church of England on this subject 250
Present fearful and lamentable tendencies of Rome . . 251
Apprehensions concerning her future final destiny . . . ib.

LETTER XII. Page 252.

On a recent proof and example of the "Destructive character of the Church of Rome both in Religion and Polity" . . 252
Gradual intrusion of the present Romish hierarchy into England from the time of Queen Elizabeth, James I., Charles I., to this day 252, 253

PAGE

Presumptuous conduct of the present Pontiff, in designating eight Romish Ecclesiastics with the style and title of Archbishop and Bishops of places in England, and in assigning to them the Provinces and Dioceses of the English Episcopate . 254
Schismatical and heretical nature of this act . . . . ib.
Shown by reference to the first four General Councils . . 255
Treasonable nature of this act 256
The Crown is the only fountain of honour, and author of titles, in England . . . . . ib.
Judge Blackstone . . . . . ib.
Case of foreign insignia of knighthood 257
An Italian Bishop now presumes to usurp the prerogative of the English Crown 258
Appeal to the future 259

APPENDIX 261
Letter from the General of the Jesuits 262
Passages from Albert Pighius concerning Scripture . . 263
Passages from Ludovicus 268
Extract from Bp. Jewell 269
Passages from Cardinal Hosius concerning Scripture . . 273
And concerning Rome's treatment of the Fathers . . . 277
Cardinal Cusanus on Scripture; and Development . . 278
Gelasius on Half-Communion 282
Leo I. on the Manichæans . . . . . ib.
Decrees of Constance concerning John Huss, and faith with heretics 283, 284
Hosius on not keeping faith with heretics 284
On the death of Coligny 285
Padre Ventura's Eulogy on Mr. O'Connell . . . . . ib.
Padre Ventura on the Council of Trent 288
The Archbishop of Paris on the Coronation of Napoleon . 289
On the persecutions in Hungary in the 17th century . . 290
The Silesian Confession 291
Persecutions in Silesia 292

ADVERTISEMENT.

*** At the desire of some Readers of the "Letters to M. Gondon," the Author has drawn up a *Table of Contents* to them; which it is hoped will not be considered out of place here.

The references are to the pages of the *Second Edition*.

CONTENTS

OF

LETTERS TO M. GONDON.

PAGE

DÉDICATION . . . . . i.—iv.

ADVERTISEMENT. Hungarian Confession . . . . vi.—viii.

LETTER I. Page 1.

Introduction to the Work.

Prayers in France for the conversion of England 1

Pope Julius the Third's Medal 2

Occasion of the present work 3

The Church Catholic 4

The Churches of Rome, France, England . . 4. 30. 270

Evils of Schism 4

Rome, how guilty of Schism 5

Difference between the case of a French layman brought up in the Roman Church, and that of an Englishman falling away to Rome: what is the position of the latter? 6

What course to be pursued by the former? 7

Mr. Newman's "Essay on Development" 8

Observation on the references to that volume in these Letters . ib.

Prospects of Europe 9

The Author of the Essay received into the Romish communion with this volume in his hands 10

What that admission intimated 10, 11

PAGE

The Essay not put into the Index, either Prohibitorius, or Expurgatorius, but lauded and lectured on by Romish Bishops 12—14. 230
Romish Unity 13
The Essay made a text-book 14, 15
The Author of the Essay received with great honour by Romish Bishops, Archbishops, a Papal Nuncio, and the Pope . 14—17
Inferences from these facts 19
"Development" the true theory of Romanism; Bp. Bull 18—24. 184
French Translation of the Essay 19
Pretended Unity of Rome: Schism between the advocates of Tradition and Development . . 21—23. 32, 33. 223
The will and practice of the Church of Rome for the time being is the Romish Rule of Faith 22. 258
The question between the Church of Rome and the Catholic Church now simplified 23
Theory of Development, its rise and progress—Cardinal Cusanus, Leo X., Gregory of Valencia, Salmeron. Examples: Vasquez, Thomas Aquinas, De Maistre, Möhler, Perrone— 22—33. 204. 220. 223
Papal Infallibility: its date 29. 249
Romish Inconsistencies 32. 34
Present position of Rome 34
Practical Results of the Essay 33, 34

LETTER II. Page 35.

The Church of Rome aims at the Destruction of Human REASON.

Rome and Nahash the Ammonite 35
The Church of England: the soundness of her Foundation. What her Rule of Faith is . . . . . 36—38. 268, 269
"Development," and the "Mystery of Lawlessness," described by St. Paul . . . . . 38—42. 242, 243. 299
The Essayist's description of the gradual rise of the Papacy, on which, according to Cardinal Bellarmine, Christianity depends 39
When the Papacy "awoke" 39. 99
The Papacy unknown to the Apostles and the primitive Church: consequent heretical condition of Rome: reference on this point to Tertullian and to Scripture . . . . . 39—42
Destructive Character of the Papacy 42
It aims to annihilate REASON 43

PAGE
It rises by demolition—Bp. Bull 42, 43
The divine origin and true use of *Reason* 45
The so called "Supremacy of Faith" 44, 45
Relation of Reason to *Faith* 46
Christianity appeals to Human Reason. Passages from Scripture 47, 48. 58
Early Christian Apologists vindicated: Dr. Barrow's account of Origen's argument against Celsus . . . . . 48—52
Montanistic practice of Rome 52. 56
Lactantius—S. Augustine on the use of Reason in Religion . 53—56
Huet and the Jesuits 56
Dr. Bentley on the Academic School 57, 58
Agreement of Scepticism and Romanism 58
Is the Pope to be obeyed? 59
Conscience is to be obeyed; but first it is to be *regulated*, and by what? . . . . . 59—61
Obedience to a human superior is necessary: but we are not therefore to obey the Pope . . . . . 61—63
Cardinal Bellarmine teaches implicit obedience to the Pope . 63
Implicit obedience to a human power is the fundamental principle of the Order of Jesuits 64
Their Constitutions exact blind and unqualified obedience to the Superior . . . . . 65—67
S. Paul and S. Augustine on the Jesuit doctrine of ends sanctifying means 65
Practical results of the sacrifice of Reason, considered with respect to man and to God 66, 67
The principle of implicit belief exemplified by the *Hungarian Confession* . . . . . 68—71
Extracts from the Hungarian Confession* . . . . 69—71

LETTER III. Page 72.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying the Authority of HOLY SCRIPTURE, *by unsettling the Canon of the New Testament.*

Holy Scripture treated by Rome as the Author of Scripture was by the Jews 73
Irreverent expressions of celebrated Romanist Divines concerning Scripture 73, 74

* See also the Original in pp. vi.—viii. at the beginning of the Letters, and a Translation in the "Sequel to the Letters, p. 186—192."

PAGE
Papal edicts concerning 74
On the Romish allegation that the Canon of the *New Testament* was not settled till the fourth Century . . . . . 75—80
Advantage thence given to Sceptics 78, 79
Toland and Collins; and Dr. Bentley's reply . . . . ib.
Destructive inferences from the above-mentioned allegation 76, 77
Romish plea that the Church (of Rome) *gave* authority to Holy Scripture 77
Bp. Milner and Mr. Newman 80
What the *true* nature of the Laodicene decree is . . . 81, 82
The Scriptures of the New Testament were *read* in the Church in and from the time in which they were written: and thus canonized . . . . . 82—84
Proof of this 82, 83
Ruffinus and others on this subject . . . . . 84—93
The office of St. John and St. Peter in canonizing the books of the New Testament . . . . . 84—89
On the *Antilegomena* . . . . . 90—96
Romish corruption of S. Augustine 94
The subject illustrated by a reference to that of Various Readings. Dr. Milner's allegation on this subject . . . 95—98
Bp. Butler and Waterland on Infallibility 96
What the Pope has done for *settling* and what for *unsettling* the Canon of Scripture . . . . . 98—101
Pope Gregory VII. on the Canon of Scripture 100
Variations in Infallible Texts 100, 101. 118, 119
Who are the real innovators—Papists or Anglicans? . 101, 102
Which is the "Old Religion" 102
What St. Jerome would have replied to a Papist . . . ib.
Inferences from the Essay on Development 103
What the real nature of the evidence of Christianity is, and how it is destroyed by the theory of the Papal Infallibility . 103, 104
And how that theory leads to Infidelity 104, 105
Blanco White 105

LETTER IV. Page 106.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying the authority of HOLY SCRIPTURE, *by making and enforcing a New Canon of the Old Testament.*

On the present Romish Canon of the Old Testament, framed at the Council of Trent 106

PAGE

What the true character of the so called General *Council* of *Trent* was—Bp. Bull's expressions concerning it—its New Creed . . . . . 106—110. 184—186
A creature and puppet of the Pope 110
Its anathemas . . . . . ib.
The impiety of its decree concerning the Old Testament 111, 112
According to it, books *become inspired* 112
Pope Gregory the First condemned by the Council of Trent . 114
St. Jerome and Cardinal Caietanus 116
Rome thinks "to change times and laws" . . . . . ib.
True position of the Apocrypha 115, 116

LETTER V. Page 118.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying the authority of HOLY SCRIPTURE, *by placing her own unwritten novel Traditions on a par with the Divine Word.*

The Latin Vulgate Version made the authentic Standard of Holy Scripture by the Church of Rome, in the place of the Hebrew and Greek Originals . . . 100, 101. 118, 119
Variations in the Vulgate 119, 120
Romish new Traditions her second Bible; independent of Scripture, inconsistent with it, and destructive of it 121—125
Romish Traditions made a rule of Faith. Sarpi, Pallavicini, and Perrone . . . . . 120—123
Rule of Faith of the Catholic Church; and of the Church of England 125 36. 38. 268
Sufficiency of Holy Scripture . . . . 126—128. 162, 163
Warnings against the Romish Doctrine on this subject . 128—130
On whom her anathemas fall 129

LETTER VI. Page 131.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying the authority of HOLY SCRIPTURE, *by strange allegorical Interpretations of it.*

Allegorical School of Interpretation; its results . . . 131
Hammond on the Gnostics 133
The Antiochene School 134
Examples of the allegorical method—Saint Worship . 135—139
How Scripture is to be interpreted 136. 149

PAGE
Transubstantiation not the doctrine of the Catholic Church: nor of the ancient Roman Church . . . . . 136—138
Instances of the Popes' Allegorical Interpretations of Scripture in support of their own claims . . . . . 140—143
St. Peter on "wresting of Scripture" 144
According to Romish divines, the *meaning* of Scripture *changes* from time to time, with the changing practice of the Church of Rome—Cusanus . . . . . 144—146
Contradictions of the Tridentine Oath 145
Examples of Romish change: in Angel Worship—Worship of the Virgin Mary—Immaculate Conception—Half Communion 147, 148
Rome, like the Pharisees, makes the Word of God of none effect 149, 150
Agreement of Popery and Neologism in their treatment of Holy Scripture . . . . . 150—158
Fearful results of this . . . . . 153—156
Hooker on allegorical interpretation 154
Bentham on the Church Catechism 155
Dryden and Dr. Milner . . . . . 156—158
How the Church of England interprets Scripture 37. 157. 160—164

LETTER VII. Page 160.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying the authority of the CATHOLIC CHURCH, *by disparaging and discrediting the Fathers of the Early Church.*

The rational reverence of the Church of England for Christian Antiquity—Casaubon, King James I., Bp. Overall, Dr. Waterland, Bp. Bull, Bp. Stillingfleet, Bp. Sanderson— 160—164. 178—180. 260
Her Rule of Faith . . . . 162, 163. 36. 38. 126—128
The Romish *disciplina Arcani* rejected by the "Essay on Development:" which propounds a theory that the "law of silence is often simply unaccountable" 164, 165
The Essayist's examples of this law examined . 165—167
Strong argument against the Papacy from the Epistles of St. Ignatius . . . . . 167—176
On the "sleep of Popes" 99. 167, 168. 39
Severus of Antioch 168
Lucian, Maximus Tyrius, Paterculus, Seneca, Epictetus, Mar-

PAGE
cus Aurelius, the Mishna, Eusebius, Josephus—remarks on the Essayist's allegations concerning these writers . . 169—177
Bp. Jewell's challenge to Papists 177, 178
Variations of Rome 178
What the true nature of the authority of the Fathers of the Church is . . . . . 179—188
Contrast between the two Councils of Nicæa and Trent . 179—186
Insinuations of Petavius, Perron, and other Romanist divines against the Fathers—Robert Nelson and Bp. Bull . 181. 43
Alleged "difficulties of the Ante-Nicene Fathers" . . 181, 182
Strange assertions of the Dublin Review . . . . ib.
The Church of Rome undermines the authority of the Catholic Church 181. 43
Why we *accept* the Nicene and *reject* the Trent doctrines 184—186
Irenæus and the Essay on Development . . . 187, 188

LETTER VIII. Page 189.

The Church of Rome countenances attacks upon the CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Allegations of the Essayist against Ante-Nicene Fathers . . 189
Council of Antioch 190
In what sense it used the word Homoousion . . . 190—193
Romanists join with Arians against Athanasians . 191—196. 181
Dionysius of Alexandria and St. Basil . . . . 195—199
Inferences from the allegation against Dionysius . . . ib.
Bishop Bull and Dr. Waterland 198
Romanist Divines making common cause with Arians . 195, 196
Allegation against Six Ante-Nicene Fathers . . . 199—204
Reference to Waterland and Bishop Bull . . . 199—202
Hooker on the good reaped from the Church by the contentions of Arianism 200
Growth of the Papal Creed . . . 22—33. 204. 220. 223
Infant Baptism: on what authority it rests: variations of Roman teaching concerning it . . . . . 205—215
Rome condemned by her own divines 207
Case of the baptism of St. Augustine and others . . 209—215
St. Cyprian's and St. Augustine's testimony concerning Infant Baptism 207, 208. 213
Testimony of Pelagius 214

PAGE

Baptism disparaged through Romanist teaching concerning it . . . . . 206—215, 216

Romish Priests authorized by the Pope to personate Anabaptists, Puritans, &c., in order to sow dissension among English Protestants . . . . . 215—216

LETTER IX. Page 219.

The Church of Rome countenances attacks upon the CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Dr. Waterland on the Romish Rule of Faith 219

Allegations of the Essayist concerning Original Sin . . . 220

Date of the Doctrine of Purgatory and Indulgences . 220, 221

Development of Doctrines . . . . . 220—223

Disputes of Romish Divines on the Immaculate Conception; Testimonies of Scripture and the Fathers on this subject 222—224

Relation of this question to the Doctrine of Original Sin . 222—226

Lælius in Lucan . . . . . 227—229

Prospects of France and Europe 229

Destructiveness of Popery 229, 230

Allegation of the Essayist concerning the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity 230

Scripture Proofs, stated by Dr. Waterland and Bp. Bell . 232—233

This doctrine proved by the practice of the Church . . . 234

Allegations of the Essayist concerning Angel Worship . . 236

His injustice toward Justin Martyr . . . . . 235—239

His similar injustice toward a Church Council . . . 239

Allegation concerning Saint Worship 239, 240

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility not held by Rome herself in the first eight centuries 240, 241

Heresies of Popes; Infidelity in the Church 242

What is evinced by the reception of the Author of the Essay on Development into the Romish Communion . . . ib.

The Man of Sin, or "the Lawless One" 38. 242, 243—299, 300

Condition and Prospects of Europe . . . . . 243—245

Of England . . . . . 242—245

The only Remedy 245

LETTER X. Page 246.

Variations of the Church of Rome.

PAGE
Bossuet and Pierre Jurieu . . . . . 246—256
Jurieu propounds the Doctrine of Development . . . 247
His words compared with those of the Essay on Development . . . . . 247—249
Jurieu's specific allegations concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity 247
Our Blessed Lord's Divinity 248
Original Sin 249
What truth there is in the assertion that doctrines have become more explicit by time; St. Augustine on this point . . ib.
In what terms Bossuet spoke of the Doctrine of Development when broached by Jurieu . . . . . 251—254
Bossuet's appeal to Bishop Bull 254
Voltaire, an advocate for Development . . . . . ib.
Petavius 254, 255
Would Jurieu have been condemned if he had been an advocate for the Pope's supremacy? 255
Jurieu condemned as a heretic for teaching the doctrine of Development; the Author of the Essay on Development received by Rome as a Confessor 255, 256
Yet Rome professes to be ever the same 256

LETTER XI. Page 257.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying the authority of the Ancient Church.

Dr. Waterland, on the conduct of Rome to Christian Antiquity, and on her Rule of Faith 256
How the Fathers have been treated by her . . . 259—265
She once professed to revere them . . . . . 258—259
Language of Thomas Aquinas, Cornelius Mussus, Melchior Canus, concerning the Fathers . . . . . 260—262
With what view the Church of Rome disparages the Fathers 263, 264
How, and on what plea, she corrupts their works . . 264, 265
Examples of *expurgation* . . . . . ib.
Gretser's language on this subject 266

PAGE
Scarcely any Edition of any Greek Father has been printed at Rome 267, 268
What is the nature of the authority which the Church of England accords to the Fathers 268, 269
Their true use . . . . . 268—271
Waterland, Daillé 269, 270
Daillé more just than Rome to the Fathers . . . . . ib.
Churches of Rome and England contrasted in their conduct toward the Fathers . . . . . 267—271
The two false systems of Theology . . . . . ib.

LETTER XII. Page 272.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying the Royal Authority and that of Civil Governments generally.

This subject treated with special reference to England 277
Nature of Royal Supremacy in England, *first*, in *Civil* matters; *secondly*, in *Ecclesiastical* 276
Oath of *Civil Allegiance*: Oath of *Ecclesiastical Supremacy* . 277
How the Pope destroys the Sovereign's *civil* rights . . 278—306
First, by antimonarchical *Laws* 279
Subverting the Civil Allegiance of Subjects 281
Secondly, by *Acts* of Rebellion against Civil Government, *e. g.* by deposition of Sovereigns, examples of this . . 283—286
Case of Pius VII. and Louis XVIII. of France . . 284—286
Dr. O'Connor 286, 287
Thirdly, by *Religious Offices* of a seditious and rebellious character . . . . . 287—290
Examples of this . . . . . 287—294
Recent revival of suppressed offices of a treasonable nature . . . . . 290—292
Temporal claims of the Papacy 292, 293
The Bull in Cœna Domini 293, 294
Rome retracts nothing 290. 295
Fourthly, by *Oaths* destructive of civil Allegiance to Sovereigns . . . . . 294—298
Oaths of Romish Ecclesiastics 296
What is to be done with these Oaths? 296, 297
Fifthly, By the solemn declarations made and ceremonies used at the Pope's Consecration and Coronation . . . 299

PAGE
The Pope sits on the Altar, and is adored by the Cardinals 299, 300
Usurpation of Divine Power in the temple of God 300. 242—270
The Pope is styled "Ruler of the World" at his Coronation . . . . . 303—306
Bishop Butler, on the Papal claims 308
What the Tiara signifies 306
Popery and Democracy; prospects of the times . . . 307

LETTER XIII. Page 308.

The Church of Rome aims at destroying Royal Authority and Civil Government, by claims of Spiritual Supremacy.

Bishop Butler on Popery, and on the English Church . . 308
What is the nature of the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the English Crown . . . . . 309—314
Its foundation . . . . . 310—317
Its limits . . . . . 311—313
How Rome tramples on Councils and on Episcopacy . 314, 315
And on the Royal Prerogative . . . . . ib.
How the Pope's claims are strengthened, and the Royal Rights are weakened, by democratical and irreligious legislation, *e. g.* by endowment of various Creeds; by stripping the Crown of its religious character; and by unchristianizing the State 317, 318
Titles from British cities to Romish Bishops . . . 317—329
How Monarchies become weak, and in danger of dissolution 317, 318—326
Example—Case of France since 1830—Judaism . . 318, 319
Anti-national position of the Church of France . . 319, 320
Consequent aggrandizement of the Papacy . . . . ib.
Alarming results of this state of things . . . . 320—324
What are the true inferences from, and the tendency of, *Concordats* and diplomatic relations with the Pope . . . 323
How they are confessions of the feebleness of Governments; and acknowledgments of the power of the Papacy . . 324
How they make Governments more feeble than before; and the Papacy more strong 325, 326
The Stag, the Horse, and the Man 326
"Leges Ecclesiæ" . . . . . ib.

PAGE
Relations of England to the Papacy 327
Measures in England for the aggrandizement of the Papacy, and the weakening of the Monarchy 328, 329
Legalization of Jesuits 328
English titles to Romish Ecclesiastics. Aggression on the Crown, which is, according to English Laws, the sole source of honour and title in England 329, 330. 317
Proposed Endowment of Romish Clergy 331
Introduction of Papal Bulls into England. Lord Keeper Burleigh 334
Relief of *English subjects*, so called, from penalties for asserting the Pope's supremacy, and denying that of their Sovereign ib.
Pleas for these measures 336
Bp. Andrewes on the Gunpowder Plot 339
A dark age . . . . . 336—340
Fallacies in the words "the Queen's subjects," and "religious opinions" . . . . . 342—344
Has the Pope *retracted* any of his own usurpations and aggressions against the English Crown? . . . . 340—345
Plea of Toleration 341
Plea that "the Queen ought to be the Sovereign of all her subjects" 344
Prospects of Monarchy in England . . . . 344—346
Lord Burleigh on the state of England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth 346
Civil allegiance is due by natural law. Bp. Sanderson . . 347
What course is dictated by Reason as that to be now pursued by Sovereigns and States towards the Papacy . . 347—349
Conclusion 349

LETTERS,

ERRATA.

Page 71, line 2 from bottom, *for* pertinebat *read* pertinebit.

— 73, line 8 from bottom, for *immune* read *immane*.

— 253, line 5, *for* During that Queen's reign, *read* During the last nineteen years of that Queen's reign: and see Mr. Charles Butler's "Historical Memoirs of English Catholics," vol. ii. p. 280, London, 1819. Watson, the last Roman Catholic Bishop, died in 1584.

[illegible] but you call my attention to an article upon them in a Roman Catholic Periodical, published in England, and you inform me that you yourself are disposed to concur in the opinions there expressed. In deference to your suggestion I have felt it a duty to give that Article an attentive perusal, and as it is probable that the statements there made may have some weight with others, as well as with yourself, it may be of some service to the cause of Truth as well as satisfactory to you that I should communicate to you the result of my examination of them through

the medium of the Press: which it is now my purpose to do.

The Periodical, to which you refer me, is the TABLET, which contains (in its Number for May 29th last, p. 369,) a critical notice of my Letters to you; and also, in a subsequent Number, (for July the 17th,) a very high eulogium on an Article in a Roman Catholic Quarterly publication, the DUBLIN REVIEW (for July, 1847), upon the LETTERS.

I should not, therefore, be dealing fairly with your reference to the TABLET, if I did not extend my observations to the DUBLIN REVIEW; and it is therefore my intention, in the following pages, to consider the criticisms of both.

It is also right for me to say that the Dublin Reviewer appears to derive some authority not only from the Roman Catholic Journal, which I have mentioned, but also from a different quarter. A highly respectable Protestant Monthly Periodical, established, and formerly conducted, by one* whose memory is revered by all faithful Members of the Church of England, the BRITISH MAGAZINE, contains two Notices of my LETTERS, one in its Number for May; the other for June last. With regard to the former of these two articles I have to express my thanks for the courteous manner in which the Reviewer, who is unknown to me, speaks of my work; in the latter I find three

* The late Rev. Hugh James Rose, B.D., Principal of King's College, London.

points which concern certain passages in my Letters, and which the Reviewer proposes for my reconsideration; and as the opinion of the Writer, as far as these three points go, coincides with that of the Dublin Reviewer, or rather, perhaps it may be said, has been adopted by him, therefore in noticing the allegations of the Dublin Review, I am obliged not to neglect the remarks of the British Magazine.

Let me here be allowed to premise, first; that I shall not pass over any of the objections made in any of these criticisms; and secondly, let me observe, that none of them in any way affect the *argument* of my Volume. *That* is untouched; and unless I am mistaken, it will be in my power to show, that although these objections are of little value *in themselves*, they are of considerable importance as furnishing occasions for such corroboration and amplification of the main statements of my Work, as it will be now my endeavour to supply; and as thus, in my humble opinion, leading to the clearer manifestation of the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, and so furnishing additional motives for gratitude to all who have been delivered from them, and giving new warnings to those who are in danger of being enslaved by them, and making fresh appeals to all who enjoy the free use of the divine blessings of Conscience, Reason, and of Scripture, to pray fervently, and to labour zealously, for the removal of those Errors and Corruptions; and to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all deli-

vered to the Saints*," and to maintain the sacred cause of the Church, which is *no where* affirmed in Scripture to rest upon the Pope, but *is* said to be "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head-corner Stone †," and to endeavour "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace ‡," not on the false footing of one human self-styled infallible authority, but on the Apostolic foundation of "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of all §."

I am,
My dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
CHR. WORDSWORTH.

* Jude 3. † Eph. ii. 20. ‡ Ib. iv. 3. § Ib. iv. 5.

LETTER II.

Videtis quàm nefaria vox; et hercle ità fecit vel plus etiam quàm dixit.—Cic. de Amic. 11.

My Dear Sir,

I proceed to the criticisms before mentioned; and I shall take them point by point, in the order in which they occur in the *Dublin Review;* because it comprises almost all the objections which are urged in the two other periodicals:—

I. The first subject selected for animadversion—and it is commented on by all the three Critics—is the use which I make of a passage in the work of Cardinal Bellarmine concerning the Pope.

First, the Tablet * thus speaks:

Bellarmine argues that the laws of morality are immutable, and that, for this very reason, we must believe that the Pope will be preserved by God from enjoining what is morally wrong, because as he is the authorized ruler of the Church he might otherwise possibly command

* Tablet, May 29, vol. viii. p. 369.

Christians, as obedient children, to offend against the laws of right and wrong, a thing too horrible to be contemplated.

The *Dublin Reviewer*, adopting the language of the Tablet, thus writes:—

We shall in pursuance of our purpose set down Dr. Wordsworth's own words, and then as briefly as we possibly can, correct his misrepresentations.

"Cardinal Bellarmine says, 'if the Pope should so far err as to *command vices* and to *prohibit virtues*, the Church would be bound to believe that vices are good and virtues are evil; unless she will sin against her conscience.'"

This is not the first time we have heard of this misrepresentation; we wish we could think that Dr. Wordsworth may be its last promulgator. The passage translated in the text is given in a note, with accurate reference to the treatise of Bellarmine, De Pontifice, iv. 5, and indeed the words are correctly cited. We hope that Dr. Wordsworth never read the chapter from which he quotes, but that he has taken his authorities on trust. The words he has produced are half a sentence, and are really the conclusion that follows from an hypothesis contrary to that which Bellarmine maintained. His argument may be given in substance thus: "if the Pope were not infallible in matters of faith and morals, he might command people to believe what is false, and practise what is evil; and as the Church is ever bound to obey the Pope, she would then be bound to believe virtue to be vice, and vice virtue." Dr. Wordsworth cannot have a greater horror of such a dereliction of duty than all Catholics have, and the Cardinal always expressed. What would Dr. Wordsworth say of us if we were to charge him with the following opinion which we give in his own words, p. 49? "The infidel might justly

assert that all our religion is a mere ψιλὴ πίστις, a bare groundless faith." We have done with his book only what he has done with that of Bellarmine, suppressed the hypothetical clause.

Such are the words of the *Dublin Reviewer*, who seems to have been emboldened to make the above observations by the following paragraph in the previously published article in the *British Magazine*.

Without descending to anything like minute criticisms, there are two or three passages in his second letter which, we cannot but think, Dr. Wordsworth will see require reconsideration.

The first is one in which he has misunderstood a passage in Bellarmine, which we have frequently seen quoted in the Roman-catholic controversy, but never without regret. In the course of his observations on Mr. Newman's Essay on Development, Dr. Wordsworth argues in the following manner:—

"Conscience, says he, is to be obeyed, however ill informed it may be: 'the Papal See has in all cases a claim on our obedience:' hence, then, our Conscience is to resolve itself into the Pope's will; and however ill informed it may be in doing so, yet it is our Conscience, and it is to be obeyed, that is, we are to pay blind obedience to the dictates of the Pope; and though 'he should command what is extreme or inexpedient,' this 'obedience will subserve our growth in illumination and sanctity.' This is the *initial* point from which your Roman doctors go backwards to the destruction of the law of conscience and of right reason, by which that law is to be discovered and applied. Thus, for example, Cardinal Bellarmine says, 'If the Pope should so far err as to *command vices* and to *pro-*

hibit virtues, the Church would be bound to believe that vices are good and virtues are evil; unless she will sin against her conscience!" (p. 60). And in a note he quotes the original: 'Bellarmin. de Pontif. iv. c. 5. Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.'

But if Bellarmine really believed (as Dr. Wordsworth seems to think) that the Pope *could* command vices and forbid virtues, what possible reason could he have for using the word 'erraret?' According to his belief the Pope was infallible, and could not err *in rebus necessariis.* Consequently, if he supposed it possible for the Pope to command vices and forbid virtues, he must also suppose such a possibility to be in some way or other reconcileable with his infallibility, and that he would *not* err in doing so. As Dr. Wordsworth understands the passage, Bellarmine is made to represent that doctrine which he considered to be the turning point in Christianity, in the most preposterous and offensive manner, and that, for no imaginable purpose, except to point out the duty of the Church in the event of something happening, which he believed, and which he is actually proving, to be impossible.

The simple fact is, that what is here stated as Bellarmine's own opinion, is not his opinion at all; but that which Bellarmine is stating as an absurdity to which he has driven an ideal opponent. The proposition which he is undertaking to prove, is not, as Dr. Wordsworth supposes, the duty of the Church in case of the Pope's erring in a certain way, but the impossibility of his erring in such a way at all. His proposition is: "Non solum in decretis fidei errare non potest summus Pontifex, sed neque in præceptis morum, quæ toti Ecclesiæ præscribuntur, et quæ in rebus necessariis ad salutem, vel in iis quæ per se bona,

vel mala sunt, versantur." And the argument which leads to his using the words which have been so strangely misunderstood, is in substance this: "If you maintain that a Pope may err in the prohibition or injunction of things good or bad in their own nature, you must maintain that the Church is liable to err even in matters of *faith*. For the catholic faith teaches that every virtue is good, and every vice bad: and, consequently, if the Pope could err by commanding what is vicious, or prohibiting what is virtuous, then the Church would be reduced to this difficulty: she must either believe what is really vicious to be virtuous, and what is virtuous to be vicious,—and so err in the faith; or else, she must sin against her conscience by knowingly doing what was wrong, or omitting to do what was right: and the consequence, on either supposition, would be, that the Church would cease to he holy, contrary to one of the articles of the Apostles' Creed." This mistake is so important, and the perpetuating it is so injurious to the cause and character of our Church, that we print Bellarmine's argument entire in the note, as a bare reading of it is sufficient to show that his meaning has been totally misrepresented *.

* "Probatur jam propositio; et PRIMÒ, quod non possit Papa errare in præceptis morum ad salutem necessariorum: quia tunc tota Ecclesia graviter læderetur, et erraret in rebus necessariis, quod est contra promissionem Domini. Joan. 16. *Cum venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit vos omnem veritatem.* Quod intelligitur (ut minimum) de veritate necessaria ad salutem. SECUNDO, quia Deus tunc deesset Ecclesiæ suæ in necessariis, quando quidem præcipit illi, ut sequatur Pontificem, et Pontificem permittit errare in necessariis. At certè si Deus nulli rei deest in necessariis, quanto minus Ecclesiæ suæ? Quod autem non possit Pontifex errare in moribus per se bonis, vel malis, probatur. NAM tunc Ecclesia non posset verè dici sancta, ut in Symbolo Apostolorum vocatur. Nam sancta dicitur potissimùm ob sanctam professionem, ut alibi ostendimus; quia minimum legem, et professionem sanctam profitetur, quæ nihil docet

Before I enter on the consideration of these remarks, I must first complete the citation from Bellarmine. After the words* quoted in the British Magazine occur the following:—"The Church is bound, in doubtful matters, to acquiesce in the judgment of the Pope, and to do what he commands, and not to do what he forbids; and lest haply it should act *against its conscience*, it is bound to believe that to be good, which he has commanded, and that to be evil, which he forbids."

And now, my dear Sir, I would first beg leave to observe that my three Reviewers, in their zeal to speak for Cardinal Bellarmine, have not allowed him to speak for himself. They seem not to have remembered that this very passage was severely censured in his life-time, and that in the *Review* which *he* wrote of *his own works*, by way of explanation, he endeavoured to set up a defence for it; which is *wholly at variance with their apologies* for him. He says, "When I affirmed that, if the Pope commanded

falsum, nihil præcipit malum. SECUNDO, quia tunc necessariò erraret etiam circa fidem. Nam fides Catholica docet, omnem virtutem esse bonam, omne vitium esse malum: si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare. De Rom. Pont. Lib. iv. cap. v."'

* *i. e.* After "contra conscientiam peccare."—"Tenetur enim in rebus dubiis Ecclesia acquiescere judicio summi Pontificis et facere quod ille præcipit, et non facere quod ille prohibet, ac ne forte contra conscientiam agat tenetur credere bonum esse quod ille præcepit (*præcipit* ed. 1596), malum quod ille prohibet." Bellarmin. de Pont. iv. 6, ed. Paris, 1620.

a vice or forbad a virtue, the Church would be bound to believe virtue to be evil and vice good, I was speaking concerning *doubtful* acts of virtue or vice; for, if he ordered a *manifest* vice, or forbad a *manifest* virtue, it would be necessary to say with St. Peter, 'We must obey God rather than man*.'"

Here, therefore, Bellarmine does two things; first, he admits the possibility that the Pope may command what *seems* a vice, and then, it being a doubtful point, the command is to be obeyed: (as if there could be *any room* for doubting against the Pope!) and next, to save his own credit, and well knowing that the *Pope* will never allow any thing to be *manifest* to others which is not manifest to himself, and that the Pope would therefore lose nothing by the concession, he admits the *possibility* of the Pope commanding a *manifest* sin, in which case, he says, the Pope is *not* to be obeyed.

This is his own defence; let it be received for what it is worth: it differs entirely from that which the Reviewers make for him.

Secondly, I would remark, that my three anonymous Critics have altogether mistaken the meaning

* Recognitio Librorum Omnium Roberti Bellarmini ab ipso edita Ingolstad, 1608, p. 19. "Ubi diximus quod si Papa præciperet vitium aut prohiberet virtutem, Ecclesia teneretur credere virtutem esse malam et vitium esse bonum, locuti sumus de actibus *dubiis* virtutum aut vitiorum; nam si præciperet *manifestum* vitium aut prohiberet *manifestam* virtutem, dicendum esset cum Petro *obedire oportet magis Deo quàm hominibus.*"

which I assign to the passage of Bellarmine. I do *not*, as they allege, cite it as intimating that Bellarmine taught that the Pope can err; but as a strong affirmation on his part, that the *Pope is ever to be obeyed.* Bellarmine's position is, that the Pope cannot err in matters of *moral duty* necessary to Salvation: for, if the Pope were to err (errare), by ordering vices, and forbidding virtues, the Church, unless it were willing to sin against its conscience, would be bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be evil; which is contrary to the hypothesis; the hypothesis being that the *faith* of the Church teaches that every virtue is good, and all vice bad. Therefore the Pope cannot err in articles of *morals* necessary to Salvation.

This, I say, is Bellarmine's argument; and *one term* of his *syllogism* is, that if the Pope were to err by ordering vices and forbidding virtues, the Church would be bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be bad, unless it were willing to sin against its conscience: and the Critics will not deny that this term contains a proposition which Bellarmine maintained, or his whole syllogism falls to the ground: and that proposition is, that *whatever the Pope commands,* is to be done, and Bellarmine repeats this term in as many words, (with the salvo, indeed, of *in rebus dubiis,* as if, I repeat, there could be any room for *doubting* against Infallibility!) when he says, at the

close of his whole argument, "The Church is bound to believe that to be good which the Pope commands, and that to be evil which the Pope forbids*."

It is strange that the Reviewers should have imagined that my allegation was, that Bellarmine did not teach that the Pope is infallible in precepts of morals. The fact is, that all the perniciousness of the Romanist doctrine which I was exposing,—the doctrine, I mean, that men must wrap up their consciences in the napkin of the Pope's will—proceeds from this very assumption of Infallibility. No one will sell himself like a captive, bound hand and foot, to a master whom he thinks liable to err: but let him once believe that master to be infallible, and, as the history of the Church of Rome has proved, he will at his bidding sacrifice every thing, Reason, Conscience, the Word of God, Natural Affections,—all that ought to be most dear to him as a Man, a Citizen, and a Christian.

But you may say, perhaps, Bellarmine believed that the Pope is infallible, and that he *could not* command vices and prohibit virtues; what right then have I to attribute to him an hypothesis which he would reject as impossible? Let me here observe, that, whatever Bellarmine may teach, it is almost impossible to say what Bellarmine really did *believe* with respect to the Pope's Infallibility, and

* See the Note in p. 10.

the passage now under consideration, together with his defence of it, presents an unhappy specimen of his tortuous and sceptical manner of reasoning *; next, I do *not* attribute to him, as his own doctrine, the hypothesis that the Pope can err, but the consequence from it; I do not say that he teaches that the Pope can command vices, but I do say, that he teaches, that *whatever the Pope commands,* is to be *done;* and I also say that this teaching could not be conveyed in a more striking manner, or in one more likely to produce the most shocking and destructive consequences than by his position, which amounts to this; What the Pope commands you is either a virtue or a vice; if it is a virtue, you may safely do it; and *if* it is vice, which I assure you it *cannot be,* for the Pope cannot err, yet even then you must obey, if you will not sin against your conscience. If the Pope were to command vices, (which, observe, I, Cardinal Bellarmine, affirm to be impossible,) yet still, even then, you, my scholars in

* Hospinian, after giving very numerous, and very striking instances of the fact, in his Historia Jesuitarum, pp. 230—242, says, p. 240, "With respect to *Bellarmine* and his practice; I, with many others, have observed this, in reading his books, that whenever he is pressed with an objection of weight, he does not care a jot whether the solution which he gives of it is inconsistent with what he has written elsewhere, provided only it serves him for the nonce, and may afford him an outlet, through which he can creep, for the present." It was this practice of his which extorted from Joseph Scaliger the words, "Bellarminus nihil credit eorum quæ scribit; planè est atheus." Scaligerana, p. 225.

faith and morals, would be obliged to do what he bids you, unless you are willing to sin against your conscience.

What teaching in the world, Sir, can be more pernicious than this? and this, I affirm, is the teaching of the Church of Rome, speaking by Cardinal Bellarmine.

Let me illustrate my argument by a parallel case in ancient history; and then show what has been the practical result of Bellarmine's doctrine, even in his own conduct.

It is mentioned by Lælius, in Cicero's work on Friendship *, that when Tiberius Gracchus was exciting seditions at Rome, some of his best friends, among whom was Q. Tubero, separated themselves from him. There was one C. Blossius, at that time, (says Lælius,) who came to me, and implored me to pardon him for still adhering to Gracchus. "The fact is," said he to me, "I have so high an opinion of Gracchus, that whatever he bids me I must do." "What!" said I, "if he bids you go and set fire to the Capitol?" "Impossible!" he replied, "he never could bid me do *that, but if* he did, I would do it."

Now mark, my dear Sir, what became of Blossius's *impossibilities!* hear how Lælius, (who was no Christian, but he never sacrificed his Reason and Con-

* Cap. xi. vol. vii. p. 828, ed. Oxon, 1810.

science to the will of a Roman Pontifex Maximus), hear, I say, how Lælius, whom his contemporaries called the Wise, proceeds, "Impious reply*!" he exclaims, "and yet Blossius *did so:* nay, he did more; not only was he an accomplice in the treason of Gracchus, but a principal; not only was he a comrade in his phrenzy, but a leader. And, therefore, he paid a heavy but just penalty for his Crimes to the State."

Now, my dear Sir, this is precisely the case with Cardinal Bellarmine: he says of the Pope what Blossius said of Gracchus,—I place implicit reliance in him; and why? *becaiise* he is infallible. Blossius had the same confidence in Gracchus; and let my Reviewers observe that I no more quote Bellarmine as saying that the Pope can err, than Lælius quoted Blossius, as allowing that Gracchus could order him to set fire to the Roman Capitol. No, we both quote them, respectively, as *denying* the possibility of the fact. But let some wise Lælius ask Cardinal Bellarmine this question; If the Pope orders you to set fire to the Capitol? Impossible! would be the answer; but if he did, I must obey. Nefaria Vox! and one which exposes the evils of the Romish system, and brings disgrace on him who utters it, and on the Church which regards him as one of her greatest Teachers—

* Nefaria Vox: et hercle ita fecit, vel plus etiam quàm dixit; non enim paruit ille Ti. Gracchi furori, sed præfuit.

and, must not I add also, on those who defend the utterance?

But further: Bellarmine believed that the Pope could not err; be it so; but *Belief* in the Pope's Infallibility does *not make* him *Infallible*, and unhappily Bellarmine's *impossibilities*, like that of Blossius, have often come to pass, and are very likely to happen again. The Pontifical Gracchus does order his followers to set fire to the Capitol; if he could, he would involve every thing in confusion. Therefore it is that Bellarmine's *consequence*, deduced from his own *most possible impossibilities* requires more attention. Yes, Sir, I repeat, these impossibilities have *often happened;* and ample evidence has been given of the fact in my LETTERS to you *. Did not Pius V., now canonized as a *Saint* by the Church of Rome, one of her Pontiffs who is lauded in the Breviary as an inflexible Inquisitor, one alas! whom the present Pope, Pius IX., declares † he has taken as his model,

* Letters to M. Gondon, p. 336, 2nd edit.

† In his Letter of July 5, 1847, to the Vicomte de Falloux, Deputy of Maine and Loire, author of a Life of Pius V.

" Cher fils, salut et bénédiction apostolique.

" L'ouvrage dans lequel vous retracez la vie du saint pontife Pie V. nous est parvenu et nous a été très agréable, à nous qui nous appelons *du nom de* notre si grand prédécesseur, bien que nous manquions de ses *vertus*. *Mais de même que nous l'avons choisi pour patron au premier jour de notre* souverain pontificat, de même nous *continuons à lui adresser* nos instantes *supplications* afin que sous ce patronage, le courage ne nous fasse jamais défaut, et que nous puissions, *comme lui*, servir le troupeau du Christ par la parole et par *l'exemple*. Pour nous, mon cher fils, nous vous aurons une grande grâce si, avec un redoublement de zèle, vous dirigez aussi vos prières vers le même

command all Englishmen to rise up in rebellion against * Queen Elizabeth? Was this to command a *Virtue?* Did not Pope Gregory XIII. go in solemn procession to the Church of St. Louis at Rome, to give public thanks for the Massacre of St. Bartholomew? Was this to sanction a *Virtue?* did not Pope Sixtus V., in a set speech, compare the mur-

but. En attendant que notre bénédiction apostolique vous soit un gage de notre gratitude, nous vous l'envoyons très affectueusement, cher fils, du fond de notre cœur paternel, et en appelant en même temps sur vous toutes les grâces du ciel.

" Donné à Rome, près Sainte-Marie-Majeure, le 5 juillet 1847, de notre pontificat la seconde année. PIE IX."

Pius V. (now a Saint of the Church of Rome) was one of the most strenuous and ruthless actors in, and supporters of, the *Inquisition* (Mendham's Life, pp. 34. 72, 73); he was one of the principal originators of the *Index Prohibitorius* (ibid. p. 36); he was one of the most active promulgators of the anathematizing and anti-monarchical Bull *In Cœna Domini* (ibid. pp. 56. 92. 140); he was one of the most diligent collectors of *Legends*, which he introduced in large numbers into his *reformed* edition of the Breviary (ibid. p. 99); he was the author of a Bull for fomenting Schisms in England, and authorizing Romanist Ecclesiastics "to devise all manner of devices" to imbroil Protestants with one another (ibid. p. 123); he was the author of the impious Bull for dethroning Queen Elizabeth and exciting her subjects to rebellion (p. 141); and, lastly, he was the main contriver of the manœuvres which led to the bloody massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day (pp. 196—212). This is the Pontiff whose name the present Pope says he has assumed, and whom, he declares, he desires to imitate, and *to* whom he thinks fit to *pray!*

* It was maintained by many in the English Seminary at Rheims, that this Bull was dictated by the Holy Ghost; whence Savage, persuaded by Dr. Gifford and Hodgson, p. 283, that it "would be a meritorious work, gladly vowed that he would kill the Queen." He thought the Pope was infallible, and therefore what he ordered was to be done. See Bp. Barlow, Brutum Fulmen, p. 184, ed. Lond. 1681.

derer of your King Henry III. to the Saints of the Old Testament, and did he not then do what in him lay to stimulate the fanatical parricide who stabbed the successor of the same King? Again, I ask, were these *Virtues*? Yet these things were not impossible; they were done; done, I say, in a public and solemn manner by Pontiffs of Rome: and therefore, either Popes *do often* command Vices; or treason, rebellion, and murder have ceased to be crimes.

But I have not done with our parallel. Nefaria vox! et tamen ita fecit, et plus etiam quàm dixit; thus said Lælius of Bossius, and so say I of Bellarmine. He was not only the accomplice of the crimes of Popes, but the instigator of them: and so he has given the most striking commentary upon this passage in his own conduct.

Pope Sixtus V., as I have said, pronounced a panegyric on the murderer of your King, Henry III. Here was an act worse than any done by Gracchus. What then did Blossius? What, I say, did Bellarmine, the great Romish Doctor of the age, do? Did he remind the Pope that King-killing is sacrilege? No. Did he even hold his peace? No. The Pope had spoken; that was enough for him: by the all-powerful agency of the Papal word the assassin had become a saint. The halter about his neck had been turned into a halo about his head: Bellarmine forgot that, by God's Law, the persons of Kings are sacred*;

* 1 Sam. xxvi. 9; 2 Sam. i. 14; 2 Sam. xix. 21.

and that "whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed *." Virtue had become Vice; and Vice Virtue. The monarch was no longer sacred; but sacred was the murderer. Bellarmine styles him a "sacratum virum †, a *consecrated man*," and calls the murder of a King, a miracle of Divine Providence! Need I remind you further, that such were the consequences of Bellarmine's doctrines in France, that his book, on the temporal power of the Pope, was condemned and suppressed by a decree of your Parliament in the year 1610?.

Thus Bellarmine acted with respect to France; now let us see his conduct to England.

In the reign of King James the First the Roman Catholic Laity of England were for the most part very ready to take the Oath of Civil Allegiance to the Crown, and their *Archpriest*, (for such was the name of their Ecclesiastical Superior in this country, there being no Roman Catholic *Bishops* in England then,) whose name was George Blackwell, exhorted them to take the Oath to his Majesty ‡.

In the year 1606, Pope Paul V. forbade the King's Roman Catholic subjects to take the Oath §; and

* Gen. ix. 6.

† Bellarmine, Responsio ad Apolog. Tom. vii. p. 671, ed. Colon. 1617. Ultus est Deus Christum suum dum per alium *Sacratum virum*, alioqui militiæ imperitum et inermem, Regem eundem non sine manifesto Divinæ Providentiæ miraculo interfecit.

‡ See his Answers on Sundry Examinations, Lond. 1607.

§ By his Brief, dated Rome 10, Kalends of Oct. 1606: which will

because this prohibition did not succeed in detaching the Roman Catholics from their natural duty to their King, he repeated it in the following year*. Thus loyalty to the Throne was made, in Romish doctrine, a sin. Although our Blessed Lord and His Apostles, St. Paul and St. Peter, command Christians to be† subject even to a heathen King, even to a Tiberius and a Nero, yet, according to the Pope, Christians could not take an oath of fealty to a Christian Sovereign, without "hurting the Catholic faith and the salvation of their souls;" and, therefore, he issued an edict from the Vatican, that the Oath to the English Monarch was not to be taken.

Such was the resolve of Gracchus: now how did Blossius act? Cardinal Bellarmine was the very person appointed by the Pope to write to the Archpriest Blackwell a letter‡ of stern rebuke, for his loyalty to the King, or, as the Cardinal calls it, for his treachery to the Pope, in taking the Oath. Nor was this all: Bellarmine also published a work§ against King James himself, in which he defends

be found in King James's Works, p. 250. ed. 1616. The Oath of Allegiance will be also found there.

* 10 Kal. Sep., 1607. See King James's Works, p. 258.

† Rom. xiii. 1. Tit. iii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 13.

‡ Dated Rome, 28 Sep., 1607. It is printed in Blackwell's Examination, Lond., 1607.

§ Under the name of M. Tortus contra Apologiam Jacobi Regis pro Juramento Fidelitatis. This book was owned by Bellarmine in his Apologia, p. 43; and it is inserted in his Works. vii. 643., ed. Colon., 1617.

the Papal Briefs and his own Letter, and impugns the Oath of Allegiance, and asserts that Sovereigns depend upon the Pope for their temporal authority; and, again, he wrote another* book, no less arrogant than the first, against the same Monarch, in which he affirms that the Pope can depose Kings, and dispose of Kingdoms, and release subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance. These books are still known among us, especially by the refutations they called forth from one of our greatest Prelates, the learned and pious Bishop Andrewes †. Such is Bellarmine's practical commentary on his own teaching.

To revert now to the passage in question. If you, Sir, had been living in the age of Bellarmine, either in this country or your own, let me put it to you, as a loyal citizen, whether it would have been any consolation to you to have been assured by all the Reviewers in the world, that the Cardinal taught that the Pope could not err in matters of morals? You would, I am sure, have called regicide a crime, and patriotism a virtue; and knowing what you must have known of the nature of the Pope's commands, you would therefore have turned a deaf ear to Bellarmine's assertions, that the Pope *could not* command what is sinful; and, in spite of all his

* Apologia Cardinalis Bellarmini contra Præfationem Monitoriam Jacobi Regis, &c., in his Works, vii. 706.

† Bp. Andrewes, Tortura Torti, Lond. 1609, and Responsio ad Apologiam Card. Bellarmini, Lond. 1610.

reasonings to the contrary, you would, I believe, have treated with the honest scorn and indignation it deserves, that other nefarious doctrine, that if the Pope should err by commanding vices, (which, by whatever name Bellarmine may choose to call them, *you* would know that the acts commanded by the Pope often *are*,) you would be bound to obey, if you would not sin against your conscience. You would have said that vices are vices, though commanded by Popes, and commended by Cardinals; and you would have been led to consider whether the assumption of this power to domineer over your conscience on the plea of guiding it, by dictates at variance with the Law of God, is not a sacrilegious invasion of divine authority; whether it is not a tyrannical outrage against your own rights, and whether the Person who arrogates to himself such a dominion over you as would make you a traitor to your Prince, and a rebel against God, can be approved by Him, or entitled to the confidence of men. You would not have imitated the example of Caius Blossius, but of Quintus Tubero; you would not have followed Gracchus when he deserted the Truth. You would have declared with the wise Lælius, that the doctrine of Blossius was nefarious; and that he who carries it out in practice deserves to be execrated, and punished as a Malefactor.

I have now but few words more to say on this passage; and it refers to a remark in the British

Magazine. The writer says, that he "has often seen it quoted (quoted, I suppose he means for the same purpose as I have quoted it) in the Romish controversy; and never without regret." On this sentence, I would observe, that it is generally the part of prudence as well as of modesty, to suppose that what has been *often* done, if done by wise men, has not been done amiss; and on the other hand, as the Poet discreetly says:—

> Homine imperito nunquam quicquam injustius
> Qui nisi quod ipse facit, nihil rectum putat.

Therefore, it deserved his consideration, whether the very fact of its having been quoted often, might not have saved him from his regret at seeing it quoted at all. The question then is, *by whom* has this passage been quoted?

It is quoted by Ames, a learned Theological Professor at Franeker, in his "Bellarminus Enervatus," (i. p. 220, ed. 1628,) with a declaration of his opinion, that this sentiment of Bellarmine deserves nothing less than an *Anathema Maranatha.*

It is quoted in a very ingenious Volume, written by a learned and religious layman, Sir Humphrey Lynde, entitled, Via Devia, or the Bye-way, a book very well worth a perusal in these times. He thus writes (p. 503, ed. 1630):—

"Now if it happen that some proselyte of a tender conscience, should make some scruple, whe-

ther the Pope ought to be heard and obeyed, when he is a murderer, a sorcerer, and a wilfull subverter of the truth, (as some Popes have been,) Hosius their doctor, wisheth them not to trouble themselves with such idle curiosities. 'God will never have thee consider,' saith he, 'whether the Pope be a Judas, or a Peter, or a Paul; it is sufficient only that he sitteth in Peter's chair; that he is an Apostle; that he is Christ's Ambassador; that he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts; from whose mouth thou art commanded to require the Law. This thing only Christ would have thee to consider*.' Again; admit a council, a whole congregation of men, should make a doubt whether the Pope may err, and by reason of that scruple, would not readily obey him, Cardinal Bellarmine, by way of prevention, gives them this lesson: 'If the Pope should so far forth err, as to command vices, and forbid virtues, the Church were bound to believe that vices are good, and virtues are evil, unless she will sin against her own conscience†.' Here is an implicit faith commanded; let the Pope's doctrine be true or false, if the Romanists will resign up their senses and un-

* Judasne sit an Petrus, an Paulus, Deus attendi non vult, sed solum hoc, quod sedet in Cathedrâ Petri—de cujus ore legem requirere jussus est. Hoc solum spectari vult. Hosius in Confess. Petric. a. 29.

† Si autem Papa erraret, præcipiendo vitia vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.—Bell. de Pont. lib. 4. c. 5.

derstanding to this virtual Church, (which is the Pope,) they shall have a priest and cardinal for their tutors. But by their leave, they may make shipwreck of their faith, by being their disciples. I proceed from an implicit faith to a blind obedience; and therein I will give you a remarkable example from another schoolman, who, above all things, doth honour and commend a blind obedience to the Church (that is, to the Pope). Gregory de Valencia tells us of an Italian merchant of Placentia, who reasoned and resolved with himself in this manner: 'I hold it is better to profess the Roman religion, than the Lutheran; first, because I can briefly learn the Roman faith: for if I say what the Pope says, and deny what the Pope denies, and if he speak, and I hearken unto him, this alone is sufficient for me: but if I should be a Lutheran, I must learn a Catechism, I must search the Scriptures, which in truth I cannot intend, when I must look after the ships of Italy, and my merchandise beyond the seas*.' You have heard the reason why this layman did dislike the Protestant religion, and what was the rule of his Roman faith; now hear what judgment this learned schoolman gives concerning this merchant; *Deum nihil habiturum:* 'God,' saith he, 'will have nothing to lay to the charge of this man at the dreadful day of judgment.'

* Laurent. Disceptatio Theolog. pag. 5.

To say nothing of this presumption, I pray God that Pagans and Infidels who knew not Christ, arise not up in judgment against them that teach such doctrine: for whereas all men by the Apostle's rule, 'should be ready to give an account of their faith,' and must be judged by the Word of God; this man by not knowing the Scriptures, nor the articles of his faith, but only for attending his merchandise, with a blind obedience, and an implicit faith, shall be free both from guilt and punishment: and no doubt, from this general belief of the Pope's authority and infallibility, the saying of Gregory the Thirteenth is verified: 'Men do with such reverence respect the Apostolic See of Rome, that they rather desire to know the ancient institution of Christian Religion from the Pope's own mouth, than from the Holy Scriptures; and they only inquire what is his pleasure, and accordingly they order their life and conversation*.'"

It is quoted by a very learned member of the University of Oxford, Henry Foulis, B.D., late Fellow of Lincoln College, in his History of Romish Treasons†; another work which may be studied with great benefit, at this day. He speaks as follows (p. 31, ed. Lond. 1681):—

"The Rabbins told the Jews, that they were to

* D. 40. Si Papa in Annot.

† Foulis' Romish Treasons. Ed. Lond. 1681, lib. i c. iv. p. 31.

believe the judges, though they told them that the right hand was the left, and the left hand the right. And this knack of credulity was lately endeavoured by the Jesuits to be an article: the famous and judicious Father Paul assuring us, that the Third of their Rules found at Padua, 1606, was, that 'Men must believe the Hierarchical Church, although it tell us, that that is black which our eye judgeth to be white*.' And something like this is the doctrine which Bellarmine himself layeth down in these words:—'If the Pope should err, in commanding vices or prohibiting virtues, then is the Church obliged to believe that vices are good, and virtues are evil, unless she would sin against her conscience†.'

"And I doubt he is willing to give to St. Peter, and by his consequence to the Pope, the power of making sin to be no sin, and that which is no sin to be a sin‡. Certain I am, that when Pope Clement the Eighth desired the said Cardinal to draw him up some private rules and directions for the benefit of the Church, he could not, in that paper of secresy,

* History of the Quarrells of Pope Paul V. with the Venetians, lib. i. p. 96.

† Si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.—Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l. iv. c. 5. Sect. *Quod autem.*

‡ Contra Barklaium, c. 31.

keep himself from flattery, by telling the Pope, he had no limits or bounds in the world but those which the world itself had*.

* * * * * *

"Pope Paul the Second told Platina† and others, that all right and power were lodged in his breast, and that his authority was such, that even according to his own pleasure and will, he could null or approve of other men's actions. And why not, seeing Baronius‡ affirms, that when Vigilius sat in the chair, that then also Christ Himself, not only as He was a man, but as He was God also, sat with him. Upon which ground it may be that Albizzi, (made Cardinal, I suppose, by this present Pope, Alexander the Seventh,) told two Cordeliers that the Gospel§ would not be the Gospel, if the Pope had not approved of it. And to go a little higher, those of Palermo having sent their Ambassadors to Pope Martin the Second, these holy men (as my Author calls them) being come into his presence, having first thrown themselves all along before his feet, thus began their speech to him:—

"'O thou who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.

* Jac. Fuligattus, Vita Card. Bellarm. l. iii. c. 5.

† Plat. in Paulo Secundo. ‡ Anno 552. Sect. 11.

§ St. Amour's Journal, p. 170. Paul. Æmilius Hist. Francor. in Vita Philippi III.

"'O thou who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.

"'O thou who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.'

"Nor did the Pope find any fault in this salutation, but only that he thought them to be hypocrites, and to have spoke him fair when he thought they perfectly hated him."

It is quoted by another very learned member of the same University, the Head of a House there, Dr. Potter, Chaplain of King Charles I., in his Volume entitled "Want of Charity justly charged on certain Romanists."

In p. 170—172 of that book are the following words:—

"But if our Mistaker will be ingenuous and speak out, he will confess that he means by his infallible Church only the Church virtual, that is, only the Pope; in whom alone all the virtue and power of the Church is eminently contained; by whom all Councils must be judged, and all controversies determined; on whom the whole frame of the Roman Catholic faith depends, and into whom it is lastly resolved. For this is the new Catholic doctrine of his new Masters, especially of the Fathers of the Society: who teach with great consent that* every Successor of St. Peter is the rock and foundation of the Church;

* Bellar. l. 4. de Rom. P. c. 3. § *Secundò, probatur.* Quilibet Successor Petri est petra et fundamentum Ecclesiæ.

that * the Pope's authority is the hinge, foundation, and (in brief) the sum of Christian faith: That † by the Church is understood the Pope, in ‡ whom alone resides all the authority of the Church and of Councils: That § the strength of all Councils depends upon him alone: That || he is the supreme Master of Christians, and judge of all controversies; and whatsoever he propounds out of his chair (and that only), must be received as the word of God: That his judgment

* Skulkenius Apol. pro Bell. cap. 6. pag. 255. Pontificia potestas est velut cardo, fundamentum, et (ut uno verbo omnia complectar) summa fidei Christianæ. Bellar. præf. in libros de Rom. Pont. § *Et quidem.* De quâ re agitur, quùm de primatu Pontificis agitur? brevissimè dicam, de summâ rei Christianæ.

† Gretser. Defens. cap. 10. l. 3. de verb. Dei, p. 1450 et 1451, per Ecclesiam intelligimus Pont. Romanum. Et, per Ecclesiam Papam interpretantur, Non abnuo. Franc. Albert. Corollar. Theol. tom. i. corol. 4. punc. 7. num. 35, 36. Dico primò, quòd præter veritatem primam revelantem, est in universo aliqua regula infallibilis, animata, rationalis, qualis est Ecclesia. Quòd autem hæc regula animata, rationalis, sit summus Pont. Romanus, non est hic locus proprius probandi, sed inter recentiores videndus Valent. 2. 2. q. 1, et Card. Bell. et Medina.—Dico secundò, stante hâc regulâ rationali infallibili, omnes Articuli fidei ultimatè resolvuntur in ipsam, tanquam in rationem formalem, quâ, in proponendo——

‡ Greg. de Valentia Anal. fid. l. 8. c. 7. § *Porrò.* Authoritas quæ in uno Pontifice residet, authoritas dicitur Ecclesiæ et Conciliorum.

§ Bell. l. 4. de Rom. P. c. 3. § *At contra.* Apparet totam firmitatem Conciliorum esse à Pontifice, non partim à Pontifice, partim à Concilio. Vide Long. à Coriol. in Sum. Concil. Prælud. 6.

|| Gretser. Defens. c. 1. l. 1. de verb. Dei, p. 16. Id solùm pro verbo Dei veneramur ac suscipimus, quod nobis Pontifex ex Cathedrâ Petri, tanquam supremus Christianorum Magister, ac omnium Controversiarum Judex, definiendo proponit.

is so absolutely infallible *, that whether he be careful or negligent in his definitions, it matters not: let him but define, and without doubt he defines infallibly: That † if he (who is the Hierarchical Church) define that to be white which the eye judges to be black, it must be so admitted: That ‡ if he should err, and command the practice of vice, or forbid the exercise of virtue, the Church were bound in conscience, to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be bad. This is plain dealing. Scriptures are obscure, unless the Pope interpret them. All Fathers and Councils may err, unless the Pope confirm them. The Church without him is a body without an head, an house without a foundation. Controversies cannot be decided, but only by his definition; and in that there can be no error, nor any appeal from it. But this being so, these men deal not plainly with us, when they pretend often in their disputations against us, Scriptures, and Fathers, and Councils, and the Church: since in the issue their final and infallible argument for their faith is only the Pope's authority."

* Valent. Anal. fid. l. 8. c. 3. ad 6. object. sive Pontifex in definiendo studium adhibeat, sive non adhibeat, modò tamen controversiam definiat, infallibiliter certè definiet. v. et Lorin. in Act. 15. 17.

† Jesuitæ in Regulis Patavii inter schedas relictis an. 1606. quum illinc ob interdictum discederent: reg. 13. Apud Paulum Sarpium Theologum Venetum in Histor. Interd. lib. 2.

‡ Bell. de R. P. l. 4. c. 5. § *Quod autem.* Si Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.

It is quoted by another very learned member of the same University, Dr. R. Crakanthorp, who was celebrated as a Master of Logic, on which he composed an elaborate Treatise, and whose Work in Defence of the Church of England against the Archbishop of Spalatro, says the Annalist of that University *, "was held for the most exact piece for controversy since the Reformation."

In that book he thus writes, (p. 290, ed. Lond. 1625.)

"You do not believe God and the Scriptures on the authority of God, but on that of the Pope: that is, you believe Christ, for Antichrist. Hence, although God expressly forbids all vices, and commands all virtues; yet, as *Bellarmine* teaches you, 'If the Pope commands vices and forbids virtues, (*which*, adds Dr. Crakanthorp, *he very often does,*) the Church is bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be bad, unless it will sin against its conscience.' Every one among you is obliged in his conscience not to believe God and Christ, but the Pope and Antichrist. He is not bound to follow virtue, in obedience to God; but to perpetrate any crime in obedience to the Pope."

It is quoted by another member of the same University, a Prelate of the Church of England, whose works concerning the Rule of Conscience and Moral Obligation are justly regarded in this country as some of the most perfect specimens of genuine Chris-

* Wood, Athenæ Oxon. ii. 362. ed. Bliss.

tian Logic that have ever been produced in any age or nation. Englishmen will know that I speak of Bishop Sanderson.

He thus writes in the Lectures delivered by him as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford two hundred years ago*. (Præl. iii. p. 77, ed. 1686.) "Holy Scripture expressly charges us neither to subject our consciences to any man's judgment, nor to lord it over the consciences of others. 'Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, (or Teacher,) even CHRIST †.' 'My brethren, be not many masters ‡.' 'Feed the flock of God which is among you, as ensamples,' (that is, as holding up to it the light of true faith and godliness,) 'but not as lords over God's heritage §.' 'Ye are bought with a price; do not *become* (*μὴ γίνεσθε*) the servants of men ‖:' Give not up your consciences to any man to be ruled by his arbitrary will.

"Hence (he adds) it follows in the first place, that every Christian ought to detest the intolerable tyranny and excessive haughtiness of the Roman Pontiff, who, when he arrogates to himself Infallibility, exercises, on that plea, (as if it were his own right,) a lordship over the consciences of men, yea, even to such a degree, that *if he calls virtues vices, and*

* De Obligatione Conscientiæ, Prælectiones Oxonii in Scholâ Theologicâ habitæ anno 1647 a Roberto Sandersono, S. Theologiæ ibidem Professore Regio, posteà Episcopo Lincolniensi. ed. 1686.

† Matt. xxiii. 10.

‡ James iii. 1.

§ 1 Pet. v. 2, 3.

‖ 1 Cor. vii. 23.

vices virtues, all Christians are bound, on pain of damnation, to prostrate themselves without demur to his judgment.

"Hence, also, *we* (Englishmen) ought to acknowledge, with all expressions of gratitude, the great and singular goodness and mercy of Almighty God towards us, in freeing us and our fathers from such an iniquitous tyranny, and restoring us, as it were by an act of reprisal, to our just Liberty."

Bishop Sanderson proceeds to say—and you will allow me to introduce the following paragraphs, because they will show that in *rejecting* the arbitrary tyranny of the *Papacy*, we do not thereby sanction *another* usurpation of a different kind, as some are wont to allege *—

"Secondly, we must take heed lest, having emancipated ourselves from *Roman* domination, we submit to a *new* yoke. If we have any regard for our own Conscience and for the peace of our Country and the Church, we must take care lest, as was formerly said at Corinth, 'I am of Paul,' I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas;' so among us should be heard such language as this, 'I am of Luther, I am of Calvin, I am of Arminius, I am of Socinus.' Nay, 'let God be

* For instance, the Dublin Reviewer, p. 457 :—"Anglican Divines have opinions and propound theories, but they have no grasp of truth; they shrink from their own conclusions, as soon as they have uttered the premises, and make strong assertions, but do not, cannot, believe what they say."

true, and every man a liar *. That man is not worthy to be Christ's who is not *only* Christ's." He then enforces the warning of the Apostle †, who condemns those who have "men's persons in admiration because of advantage," and of St. Paul, who says that men will be prone to heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears ‡. "But with all this," he concludes, "in order that, first, the Universal Church, and that, next, men of learning and piety may not be deprived of their due authority, we must *also* remember, *first*, that very great deference is to be paid to the Judgment and Practice of the Universal Church, in the Interpretation of Scripture, and in deciding questions of Faith and Morals; and *secondly*, that the judgment of learned men has weight in satisfying scruples, and in directing the conscience in doubtful cases, where certainty cannot otherwise be had."

But to return. *It is quoted* by another very learned member and Master of a College in the same University, who was one of the successors of Bishop Sanderson in the See of Lincoln, and enjoyed like him a high reputation for his skill in determining cases of Conscience. I mean Bishop Barlow; who in one of his works, in which he examines the principles of the Papacy, particularly as shown in the excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, thus writes:—(Brutum Fulmen, Second Edition, Lond. 1681, p. 160.)

* Rom. iii. 4. † Jude 16. ‡ 2 Tim. iv. 3.

"Nay, so far are they in love with their most irrational hypothesis,—that to believe as the Church believes, excuses their laics and the unlearned from Heresy,—that they expressly say, That such men may in some cases (not only lawfully, but meritoriously) believe an error contrary to Scripture, which in another more knowing person would be a real and formal Heresy. The case is this, (as Cardinal Tolet and Robert Holkott propose it *,) If a rustick or ignorant person, concerning articles of Faith, do believe his Bishop proposing some heretical opinion, he does *merit* by believing, although it be an heretical error; because he is bound to believe, till it appear to him to be against the Church. So that in the mean time he is no heretic. For, 1, He may lawfully do it. 2. He is bound to do it, to believe his Bishop, and the Doctrines proposed by him. 3. Nay, it is a meritorious action to believe such heretical errors, though it be contrary to Scripture and the Word of our gracious

* Rursus, si rusticus circa Articulos credat suo Episcopo, proponenti aliquod dogma hæreticum, in credendo meretur, licet sit error; quia tenetur credere, donec ei constet esse contra Ecclesiam. Tolet. Instruct. Sacerd. l. 4. c. iii. § 7. Idem habet Rob. Holcott. in I. Sentent. Quæst. I. in Replica. ad 6. Principale: where he tells us, that simple people may err in many things, dummodo velint credere sicut Ecclesia Catholica credit. And when he puts the case in an old simple woman, and says————Si audiat Prælatum prædicantem propositionem erroneam, quam ipsa nescit esse erroneam, et ei credit: non peccat, sed tenetur errare, quia tenetur ei credere; et meretur volendo credere errorem; et concedo (inquit) quod ipsa potest adipisci meritum debitum martyri, si ipsa interficitur pro tali errore, quem credit articulum fidei, &c.

God. This is strange Doctrine, yet publicly maintained by * their Casuists and Schoolmen, and approved by their Church. For I do not find it condemned in any Index Expurgatorius, nor (in any public Declaration) disowned by their Church; et quæ non prohibet peccare aut errare, cum possit, jubet." Bp. Barlow then cites the words of Bellarmine; as will be seen in the note at the foot of this page.

It is quoted by an English Divine of the present day, whose works concerning the History and Doctrines of the Church of Rome are distinguished by profound and extensive erudition, the Rev. Joseph Mendham; in the following terms † :—

"This" (he is speaking of a statement made by Pope Pius V.) "is something like the celebrated assertion, (for so it is, although a link,) that 'if a Pope

* Especially the Jesuits. In the end of the Exercitia Spiritualia Ignatii Loyolæ, Tolosæ, 1593, there are Regulæ Servandæ, ut cum Ecclesiâ verè sentiamus; the first of which is, Sublato proprio omni judicio, tenendus est paratus animus ad obediendum veræ Ecclesiæ. You may be sure they mean the Church of Rome. The Thirteenth Rule is this————Si quid quod oculis nostris album apparet, Ecclesia nigrum esse definierit, debemus itidem, quod nigrum sit pronunciare. And to the same purpose Bellarmine tells us————Fides Catholica docet, omnem virtutem esse bonam, et omne vitium malum. Si autem Papa erraret, præcipiendo vitia et prohibendo virtutes, tenetur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas———— Tenetur credere bonum esse quod ille præcipit, et malum quod ille prohibet. Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 5. § ultima. Ita etiam V. Erbermanum contra Amesium, tom. i. l. 3. c. 6. § 5. p. 401, 402.

† Mendham's Life and Pontificate of Pius V., chap. vi. p. 190. London, 1832.

determine virtues to be vices, and the contrary, the Church is bound to believe.'"

Mr. Mendham adds as a note; (Bellarmin. de Summo Pontifice, lib. iv. cap. v. sect. ult.)

"The Cardinal found some exercise for his Jesuitic talents in explaining and defending this declaration, which, notwithstanding his ingenious comment, *stands unmoved* in its original and obvious sense; nor is he able to disentangle himself from the net, in favour of private judgment, which he spread for his own feet." "See Recognitio Librorum omnium R. B. ab ipso edita, Ingolstad, 1608, pp. 19, 20 *."

Lastly; to pass from *Protestant* authors, I will now only observe,—*It is quoted* by an eminent person of Bellarmine's own order and school, his celebrated contemporary, the Jesuit Gretser, who, in his Defence of Bellarmine, expounds this passage as follows: "Almighty God would have been wanting to His Church in things necessary to Salvation, if the Roman Pontiff could err in moral precepts on necessary points: for the *Church would be bound to obey him as her Supreme Pastor*, and yet, by obeying him, would fall into a pernicious error †."

Whether now, Sir, the writer in the British Magazine will read these quotations "with regret," it is not

* I have quoted from the edition of Paris, 1620; i. e. posterior to this *Recognitio*. The Cardinal changed nothing in the passage after the edition of 1596, except *præcipit* into *præcepit*.

† Gretser, Defensio Bellarmini De Pontifice, iv. 5, (i. e. this Chapter,) Vol. ii. p. 1029, ed. 1609.

for me to say; but I am disposed to think that the Dublin Reviewer is right in anticipating that this passage of Cardinal Bellarmine, the great Doctor of the Church of Rome, will *still continue to be quoted*, as a remarkable expression of the results,—results made more striking by the living Commentary of Bellarmine's own acts, both as regards your history and ours,—to which the Romish doctrine of the Pope's Infallibility leads.

I cannot forbear observing, that, while one of our Universities, that of Cambridge, had the honour of rearing the man—called by the Editor of his Devotions, "Doctor Andrewes in the Schools, Bishop Andrewes in the Pulpit, and Saint Andrewes in the closet,"—who refuted in two treatises the unscrupulous and seditious writings of Cardinal Bellarmine against the English Crown; the other University, that of Oxford, as is shown by the above extracts, rendered signal service to the cause of Religion, of Loyalty, and of Liberty, in England, Europe, and the World, by the strenuous opposition which some of her most eminent men gave to the doctrine of implicit obedience to the Pope as taught by the Romish Cardinal; and we owe it under divine Providence to them, and to such as them, with whom the Church of England has been blessed in past ages, that we have not been brought again under the yoke of Papal usurpation, and that we have now the means of contending against the anarchical power which in our own time has assumed

the specious name of Christian Liberalism, and which hopes to use the Church of Rome as an instrument for advancing Democracy, while there is too much reason to fear that Rome, on her side, has conceived the design of aggrandizing herself and weakening all lawful powers, by putting on the mask of Liberty, and by proclaiming herself to the world as, forsooth, the enemy of arbitrary rule, while she claims for herself an uncontrolled dominion, not less than that of Omnipotence itself, over the Consciences of all men, and holds in her hand her Breviary in which she worships as Saints those very Pontiffs * who lighted the fires of the Inquisition, and cancelled Oaths of Allegiance, and excited subjects to Rebellion, and attempted to sanctify Murder, and fed their flock with Legends, and withheld the Scriptures from the people!

I am, Sir,

Yours truly, &c. &c.

* Saint Pius V., and Saint Gregory VII. See Letters to M. Gondon, p. 279—291, 2nd edit.

LETTER III.

" A l'égard du Chef suprême de l'Eglise, les Jésuites se croient liés par des obligations beaucoup plus rigoureuses. Ils croient lui devoir une part beaucoup plus large dans leurs affections et dans leur dévouement. A leur yeux, le Souverain-Pontife n'est pas seulement un Prince temporel auquel ils doivent la soumission et le respect : il est surtout pour eux un Père et le Représéntant de Jésus-Christ. A ce titre, il reçoit des Jésuites des témoignages tout particuliers de culte, de vénération. Tous les actes qui émanent de son autorité sont accueillis par eux avec amour. Les dispositions qu'il croit devoir prendre pour l'administration de ses Etats, ils les approuvent et les défendent ; ses avis sont pour eux des ordres ; et leur plus grand malheur serait de contrister son cœur paternel.

" Je repousse donc de toute l'énergie de mon âme, monsieur le rédacteur, et en mon nom et au nom de l'Ordre tout entier qui m'a nommé son chef, la calomnie à laquelle vous avez ouvert les colonnes de votre journal. Il est aussi contraire à la vérité qu'à la notoriété publique que les Jésuites soient *en état de complot permanent* contre l'auguste Pontife que l'univers entier salue de ses acclamations. Aimer, vénérer, bénir, défendre le pape Pie IX, lui obéir *en toutes choses*, applaudir aux sages réformes et aux améliorations qu'il lui plaira d'introduire, est pour tous les Jésuites un devoir de conscience et de justice qu'il leur sera toujours doux de remplir. Ce devoir, commun à tous les sujets des Etats romains, sera d'autant plus facile à remplir que le saint Pontife assis aujourd'hui sur la chaire de Pierre joint au caractère sacré dont il est revêtu toutes les vertus que l'Eglise honore, toutes les grandes qualités que la monde admire. Ce sera de plus pour les Jésuites en particulier un devoir de reconnais-

sance, puisque dès le jour où Pie IX a ceint la triple couronne, *il n'a cessé de donner à la Compagnie de Jésus des gages de sa bienveillante et paternelle affection.*

"Je vous prie d'agréer l'assurance de tous mes sentiments.

"ROOTHAN,

"*Général de la Compagnie de Jésus.*"

"Rome le 14 Septembre, 1847*."

MY DEAR SIR,

Such is the important declaration publicly made in a recent letter to one of your French Journals†, by the successor of Ignatius of Loyola, the present Head of the Order of Jesuits, from his residence at Rome, concerning the relation of that Society to the present Pontiff. It bears, as you see, strong testimony to the devotion of that Order to the Pope, and of his affection to them. This statement will give particular interest to the subject of inquiry, whereon we are now entering, which refers to a passage cited in page 65 of my Letters to you from the Constitutions of that Order.

The Writer in the *British Magazine* comments as follows on that quotation:—

Another passage ‡, which Dr. Wordsworth has most unaccountably misunderstood, is one he has quoted from the Constitutions of the Jesuits. Having referred to some of the well-known expressions which the founder of the Jesuits has used to teach the members of his Order, the

* The former part of this Letter will be found in Appendix A. of this volume.

† Courrier Français.

‡ *I. e.* another beside that of Bellarmine, considered in my preceding Letter.

degree of corpse-like obedience he required them to pay to their Superior, Dr. Wordsworth says:—

"And, as if this was not enough, it is expressly said, that the Superior may bind the members of the Society to commit *mortal sin*, 'in case it shall be *very conducive* to the good of an individual, or of the whole. And in this case it is commanded, that the person bound to Sin should feel love and desire of all perfection, instead of any fear of offence.'"

And, in a note, he refers to the Constitutions, Pars vi., c. 5, and quotes a part of it, which we need not transcribe here, (as we shall quote the whole presently,) but merely observe that Dr. Wordsworth states in this note, that "the Constitutions are *not* to bind to mortal sin, NISI Superior id in Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, vel in virtute Obedientiæ, juberet, &c." The same meaning has been ascribed to this Constitution, in an edition published in 1838, with an English translation; and the latter part of the chapter, both in the original and the translation, (from the words *Nisi Superior*,) is printed in capitals—which, in truth, would seem scarcely needed, to give emphasis to such a passage, if it meant anything like what the Translator and Dr. Wordsworth have supposed.

Surely, one would have thought, any person of Dr. Wordsworth's abilities and information, must have seen at a glance the impossibility of a man so shrewd as the author of the Constitutions, supposing the case of a superior commanding a member of the Society to commit mortal sin *in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ*. The truth is, that the whole meaning and intention of the chapter has been utterly misunderstood. The title of the chapter is, "Quod Constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt," which does not mean, as the English translator imagined, "that the Constitutions involve no obligation *to commit sin*,"—or

anything like it: but it means, that the Constitutions do not create such an obligation as to make a breach or neglect of them a sin. In accordance with the whole spirit of his institution, it is the command of the superior which the founder makes it sinful to disobey; and the spirit in which he wishes the Society to conform to his Constitutions, is not the spirit of fear, which would result from feeling that every word of their rule was binding under pain of incurring the guilt of mortal or venial sin, but the more free and generous spirit of love, and a desire of universal perfection. For this purpose the Chapter provides that (always excepting the expressed vow of obedience to the Pope for the time being, and the three other essential vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience) no Constitutions, Declarations, or rule of living, can induce such an obligation as makes obedience to them binding under pain of mortal or venial sin, *unless* in any particular instance the Superior should command the observance of any of them, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of obedience. And this he has the discretionary power to do in certain cases.

The following is the whole chapter referred to:—

"*Quod Constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt.*

"CAPUT V.

"Cum exoptet Societas universas suas Constitutiones, Declarationes, ac vivendi ordinem, omnino juxta nostrum Institutum, nihil ullâ in re declinando, observari; optet etiam nihilominus suos omnes securos esse, vel certe adjuvari, ne in laqueum ullius peccati, quod ex vi Constitutionum hujusmodi aut ordinationum proveniat, incidant, visum est nobis in Domino, excepto expresso Voto, quo Societas Summo Pontifici, pro tempore existenti, tenetur, ac tribus aliis essentialibus Paupertatis, Castitatis et Obedientiæ,

nullas Constitutiones, Declarationes, vel ordinem ullum vivendi, posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere; nisi Superior ea In Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, vel In virtute Obedientiæ juberet: quod in rebus, vel personis illis, in quibus judicabitur, quòd ad particulare uniuscujusque, vel ad universale bonum multùm conveniet, fieri poterit: et loco timoris offensæ, succedat amor et desiderium omnis perfectionis; et ut major gloria et laus Christi Creatoris ac Domini Nostri consequatur *."

The phrases here used, *obligatio ad peccatum* and *obligatio peccati*, are equivalent to *obligatio sub pœna peccati*. It is easy to multiply examples from the Constitutions and Declarations. Thus, in the Examen Generale, on the interrogation of candidates, "*Obligatio* vera dicendi in examine, *ad peccatum* esse debet." (Cap. iii. § 1, Declar.) In the chapter, *De auctoritate vel providentia, quam Societas habere debet erga Præpositum Generalem*, "Quarta est, quod si quis urgeret (licet cum non *obligando sub pœna peccati*) ut dignitatem aliquam admitteret, in qua Præpositi officium necessario relinquendum esset, non posset sine consensu societatis eam admittere." (Pars ix. Cap. iv. § 5), where the Declaration says: "nec Societas approbabit, si Pontifex præcepto,—*quod ad peccatum obliget*, non compelleret." And in the following chapter, "Si ageretur de dignitate, quam ut plurimum pati non potest Præpositi officium, si non compulerit talis Obedientia Summi Pontificis, *quæ ad peccatum obligare posset* †," &c. Pars ix. Cap. v. § 6), where the Declaration has "nisi Obedientia Sedis Apostolicæ intercederet, quæ Præpositum, vel Socie-

* We quote from the Antwerp edition of 1635, Superiorum Permissu.

† Even the English translation referred to above renders this "unless such obedience to the Pope, as is *compulsive under the penalty of sin*, oblige him, &c."

tatem (ut dictum est) *ad peccatum obliget*, nisi res ad effectum perducatur." Again, in requiring a vow from the professed, not to seek, or take prelacies, &c. " Promittant etiam Deo ac Domino Nostro ad nullam etiam extra societatem prælationem, vel dignitatem obtinendam se quidquam acturos: nec ad sui electionem ad hujusmodi munus, quoad ejus fieri poterit, consensum præstituros; si ejus Obedientia, *qui sub pœna peccati potest præcipere*, eos non compulerit." (Pars x. § 6.) And on this the vow itself is formed. " Promitto præterea, nunquam me curaturum, prætensurumve extra Societatem prælationem aliquam vel dignitatem; nec consensurum in mei electionem, quantum in me fuerit, nisi coactum Obedientiâ ejus, *qui mihi præcipere potest sub pœna peccati.*" (Formula votorum, p. 367.)

We should not think of multiplying these proofs of what seems so very obvious, had the mistake been sanctioned by a less respectable writer than Dr. Wordsworth, and did it not seem so very important to guard the Church against the injury which is sure to arise from charges against Romanism or Jesuitism, which are founded on a misapprehension of the meaning of authorities.

Such is the language of the British Magazine; which seems to have emboldened the Dublin Reviewer to write as follows:—

It is expressly said, that the superior may bind the members of the society to commit *mortal sin*," p. 65. It requires no effort on the part of Protestants to believe this of the Jesuits; but we are surprised at the hardihood of Dr. Wordsworth, who has actually cited in a note the Constitutions of the society, to prove so wicked and groundless a charge. The note is as follows: Pars vi. c. 5. " The

constitutions are *not* to bind to mortal sin, NISI superior *id* in nomine D. N. J. C. . . . . juberet." We do not cite the whole of course, for the rest is not relevant; we print the word *id* in italics, for a reason that will appear by and by. The title of the chapter which Dr. Wordsworth quotes from, is, *Quod constitutiones peccati obligationem non inducunt;* that is, the Constitutions do not bind under pain of sin, which is a very different thing.

It is therein expressly provided, that excepting the four vows, all declarations and ordinances, if not duly observed, do not involve him who fails therein in the guilt of mortal or venial sin—*peccatum mortale vel veniale*—unless the superior should enforce those declarations and ordinances in the name of God, or in virtue of obedience. Dr. Wordsworth has here misquoted his authority, he has the word *id* after *superior*, and refers it to mortal sin; for without that change the accusation could not be sustained: whereas the text has *ea*, referring to the Constitutions of the society. But what shall we say of the learning of a man who cannot read Latin, or of his honesty who cites his documents untruly?

The passage in question from the Constitutions is now before the eyes of the reader, in the extract from the British Magazine (above, p. 45); I am charged by both my Critics with misrepresenting its sense.

First: Is this the case, or not?

Secondly: The Reviewers not only reject my version, but give another of their own. Is theirs the genuine sense or not?

Thirdly: If the meaning assigned by the Reviewers is the true sense of the passage, does this in any way retrieve the credit of the Author of the

Constitutions, and of the Order which is governed by them; or the contrary?

Concerning the first of these three questions, permit me to say, that when we have a book to interpret, it is our duty to render it in a grammatical manner, and not in an ungrammatical one. Next, if the Author of the book *means* something which his words *so* interpreted do not express, the Translator is not to blame if he does not divine the meaning; but the Author himself is either a bad writer, or a bad man.

This being premised, I would observe that the Latin phrase *obligare ad aliquid*, in its natural sense, means to *oblige a person to do something;* and the words *obligatio rei* mean an *obligation to something;* and in this sense they are commonly used. For instance, I turn to a book written by a person who was indeed entitled to the character of "*a shrewd author*," (which the British Magazine applies to Ignatius Loyola, the framer of the Constitutions,) I mean Bishop Sanderson, because *he* united Christian innocence with intellectual acumen, and in this Volume I find the above-mentioned phrase employed about a hundred times*, in what you will allow me to call

* Prælectiones, ed. Lond. 1686. For example;
p. 110. ad quorum observationem obligantur.
118. id ad quod obligatur quis;
119. obligare conscientiam est aliquem obstringere ad obediendum. [p. 121]

its plain honest sense, of the *obligation to perform such and such an act;* that is, in the sense which I have given it in my translation of the passage in the Constitutions of Ignatius.

Nor is this all. I open the *Constitutions* themselves; and there I find the phrase used in *precisely* the *same sense.* Thus (p. 19*) ad matrimonium obligare, is to oblige to matrimony; p. 142, obligare ad Missas celebrandas, is to oblige to perform Mass; so also in p. 142, obligationes Missarum; so again, in p. 143, obligationes Lectionum, obligations to Lectures; so again, p. 172, a similar phrase occurs twice; so again, p. 189, obligatio inducitur and obligari ad aliquid, an obligation is created to do such

p. 121. rei illicitæ nulla potest esse obligatio: 156, rei impossibilis nulla est obligatio.

121. nemo potest obligari ad contradictoria; si lex ejusmodi esset obligatoria, obligaret ad id faciendum, ad quod non faciendum Lex Dei obligaret. See also 122.

124. potest ad id officium denuo se obligare voto.—quotquot sumus Christiani, cum sacro fonte tingeremur, novo nos fœdere baptismali obstrinximus ad fidem—ad abrenuntiandum Satanæ—ad observanda Dei mandata, ad quæ tamen omnia præstanda nos ante obligatos fuisse certissimum est. See also 136. 140, 141. 147, 148.

Deus obligat conscientiam ad parendum Magistratui, 174. De Juramenti Obligatione, p. 35. Obligatio omnis est *ad officium.* There is one passage in which Bishop Sanderson appears to use the phrase in the same sense as that assigned to it by the Reviewers, but then he explains it by the words *imputari ad.* Prælect. vi. p. 154. Nemo potest jure obligari ad id faciendum, cujus omissio non potest ei imputari ad culpam; nec debet ei imputari ad pœnam; omnis enim obligatio aut ad culpam est aut ad pœnam, vel etiam utramque; sed rei impossibilis omissio non potest alicui imputari ad culpam.

* Ed. Antwerp, 1635.

an act; so again, p. 250, obligari ad Missas perpetuas in suis ecclesiis dicendas vel ad curam similem—all expressions involving the idea of obligation to a positive duty; according to the ordinary sense of the words.

Besides, you will observe that in the original passage the words stand thus: Nisi Superior Ea in Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi vel in virtute Obedientiæ juberet. What does Ea, a neuter plural pronoun, refer to? I * interpreted it as referring to the *neuter* words, "peccatum mortale aut veniale," which *immediately* precede it. Both the Reviewers censure me for doing so; and what do they do themselves? They refer it to "Constitutiones, declarationes vel ordinem ullum vivendi;" that is, to more distant nouns of different genders. Here again I have treated my author as writing grammatically: they have not done so; but have blamed me for doing as I myself should wish to be done by.

Again: when I was making the citation, I referred to the English Version of the Constitutions, published at London in the year 1838; for let me assure the writer in the British Magazine, that it did occur to me to consider—*not* whether "so *shrewd a man* as the Author of the Constitutions," but whether

* The Dublin Reviewer will, I think, see that his imputation with respect to my alteration of *ea* into *id* is wholly groundless: I was speaking of *mortal* sin only, (it not being worth while to say any thing of venial,) and therefore I could not have written *ea*, unless I wished to make Ignatius guilty of false Latin.

any man could "suppose the case of a Superior commanding mortal sin in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." I referred, I say, to the English Version; and I found that the Translator, who may be supposed to be well versed in the Latinity of the Constitutions, had *rendered it precisely as I have done.*

Still further: in your researches into your own history, you may be familiar with the records of the celebrated judicial Cause of the University of Paris against the Jesuits, pleaded before your French Parliament in 1564. The prosecution was conducted by one of the most acute lawyers whom France ever produced, Stephen Pasquier, Privy Councillor and Attorney General, who afterwards published the speech which he made on that occasion. He there demonstrates*, that in the year 1554, that is, two years before the death of Loyola, the Society had been condemned by the Theological Faculty of Paris as prejudicial to Governments, as depriving temporal and ecclesiastical Rulers of their rights, and as fomenting sedition and rebellion in the people†. To his speech, in this celebrated cause, Pasquier

* Pasquier, Œuvres de, Amst. i. 1723, Recherches sur l'Histoire de France, Liv. iii. p. 359.

† Ibid. p. 339, in præjudicium Principum et Dominorum temporalium—dominos tam temporales quam ecclesiasticos suis juribus injuste privat; perturbationem in utrâque politiâ, multas in populo querelas, multas lites, dissidia, contentiones, æmulationes, rebelliones variaque schismata inducit.

added some important documents concerning the civil principles of the Order of Jesuits.

Permit me here a short digression on this important subject. Pasquier shows that from its very infancy the Order had endeavoured to propagate *democratical* principles, under the auspices of the *Papacy*. For this purpose, Kings were stripped by it of their sacred character; and might be cashiered by their subjects at will. Indeed, in reading their doctrines concerning Civil Government, as cited by him, you might suppose that you held in your hand the resolutions of a Jacobinical club of the year 1790, or Dr. Price's famous Sermon at the Old Jewry, whose design, as shown by Mr. Burke, in his Reflections on your Revolution*, was to prove that "by the principles of the Revolution of 1688, the People of England have acquired three fundamental rights,

"1. To choose our own governors.

"2. To cashier them for misconduct.

"3. To frame a government for ourselves."

Precisely in the same manner, as Pasquier shows, the Jesuits taught, that "a King, who governs tyrannically, may be judged and deposed by his people, although they have sworn to him perpetual obedience; if after monition he does not reform†." Again: "A King may be deposed by the State for tyranny; and if he does not do his duty, (when there is any just

* Burke's Works, v. 49. † Ibid. p. 358.

cause,) another may be chosen in his place by the majority. *Some* say this may be done only for tyranny."

Thus, Sir, as Pasquier proves, the civil principles of the Order of Ignatius are very well suited to promote Democracy. The fact is, that when the Order of the Jesuits was instituted, the *direct* deposing Power of the Pope was beginning to be worn out, and some new means for maintaining it were to be devised. Cardinal Bellarmine, one of the most distinguished members of the Jesuitical Order, propounded the theory, that the Pope has no *temporal* power by divine right; but that by reason of the universal *spiritual* power, which he possesses by divine right, he has supreme authority in temporal matters (in ordine ad spiritualia), *with a view to a spiritual end:* and that the spiritual ends of the Church *cannot* be attained, *except* the Bishop of Rome have power to depose Kings, and dispose of their kingdoms, if he holds it to be expedient to do so*.

This theory was more fully developed by other eminent Members of that Order. They saw that for the purpose of aggrandizing the Papacy, the Kingly power must be weakened; the foundations of Monarchical authority must be undermined, and the persons of Sovereigns must be despoiled of the

* See Bellarmine, De Potest. Pontif. v. 1; and Bp. Overall's Convocation Book, p. 229; Phelan's Digest, ii. pp. 72. 77. 83. 94. 109.

sanctity with which Holy Scripture has invested them. For this purpose, Kings were no longer to be treated as Vicegerents of Almighty God. The divine origin of their power was to be denied; and *no* power was to be left standing, as of divine authority, but that of the Pope; and he was to be adored as a Deity upon earth. Ecclesiastics are his subjects, and, as such, are exempt from civil allegiance. Rebellion on their part is not Treason, because they are not subjects of the Civil Power *. And in order that this doctrine might gain a readier acceptance in the world, a bait was to be held out to the *People*, who were to be flattered with the idea that Kings are their nominees, and may be dismissed by them at pleasure. Thus the People was, as it were, to be taken into partnership by the Pope. This was the doctrine of the greatest teachers † of the school of Loyola; and it bore its fruits immediately. The history of your Country and our own, during the latter half of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, is filled with the record of a succession of plots against the government, and of assaults upon the persons of Sovereigns. Two of your Kings, who hoped to conciliate the abettors of these doctrines ‡, Henry III.

* Clerici rebellio in Regnum non est crimen læsæ majestatis quia non est subditus Regi—from the Aphorisms of Emanuel Roman Sa, quoted by Pasquier, p. 357.

† See Hospinian, Hist. 215—219.

‡ Henry III. had established the Jesuits at Bourges, and he had

and Henry IV., fell victims to them. *Our* King James First, and his predecessor Queen Elizabeth, who acted in the firm faith that Monarchs are God's Ministers, were preserved in a wonderful manner by His Providence from repeated attacks. These principles have now been revived in your own country *. To what fearful results may they not lead!

a Jesuit confessor. Henry IV. abjured Protestantism, 1593; in 1602 he recalled the Jesuits, in the hopes of conciliating them; in 1610 he was murdered.

* Thus in a series of elaborate articles, on the Théologie de M. Liadières, who has endeavoured to maintain the cause of the Crown on the principles of the old Gallican Church, a writer in the Univers, 16 Sep. 1847, says, "Que doit-faire une société (*respublica*) tyranniquement opprimée par son prince légitime (*a legitimo suo principe*)? demande un auteur dont l'autorité n'est pas méprisable (27), et il répond: Contre un tyran par trop insolent (*nimis insolentem*), on peut procéder par autorité publique de telle sorte qu'il soit déposé et chassé (*deponatur et ejiciatur,*) ou par la société (*a republicâ*) ou par l'assemblée du royaume (*seu comitiis regni*), ou par le pouvoir placé au-dessus de lui (*a superiore*), si un tel pouvoir existe. Car la puissance royale a été donnée *au roi par la société*, qui peut le lui ôter si son régime tend manifestement au détriment de la chose publique. La société, en effet, n'est censée *avoir donné cette puissance* qu'autant qu'elle serait nécessaire soit au bon gouvernement, soit à la conservation du royaume.

"Tel est le sentiment commun des théologiens;" that is, of the Jesuit school. Such are the doctrines now taught in France by "*Christian Liberals.*"

(27) Sylvius, tom. iii. p. 410.

(28) Voyez BONAVENTURE: lib. ii. *Sentent.*, dist. XLIV. art. 2, q. 1. ad 5.—SUAREZ: Disp. xiii. *de Bello*, sect. 8, 2 concl.—LESSIUS: *De just. et jure*, lib. ii. cap. 9, dub. iv. n° 11.—ESTIUS: *in lib.* 11, *sentent.*, dist. quadracesim. quart., § 2, p. 397, 2. col.—CAJETAN: Ad quæst. 42, 2-2, art. 2.—SOTO: *De just. et jure*, lib. v. quæst. 1, art. 3, prim. dub., et lib. iv. q. 4, art. 1.—NAVARRE: *Summa* verbo *princeps*, n. 11.—SYLVESTRE: *Summa*, verb. *tyrannus.*—VALENTIA: Disput. v.

Most persons have heard of the work of the Spanish Jesuit, Mariana, "Concerning a King, and a King's Education," which was published at Mayence, in 1605. In it, it is laid down that "the power of the People is greater than that of the Prince," that "the People may declare a Sovereign to be a Tyrant," and when this is done, "any private person may murder him *;" and the Author praises Jacques Clement, the murderer of Henry III., as having done "a memorable deed †," and "gained himself a glorious name." Now, Sir, observe, when this book had done its work, and Henry IV. was first stabbed by the Jesuit Jean Chatel, and afterwards murdered by the Jesuit Francis Ravaillac, and the Parliament of Paris sentenced the book to be burnt, then the Jesuits and their partizans were full of indignation, not against the murderer, but against the slanderous imputation, as they called it, that Mariana's doctrine was *their* doctrine. It was only, they said, the opinion of a private individual, and not that of the Order ‡. It was much to be regretted, that they had not declared this sooner; but, however, their

q. 8, *de homicid.* punct. 3.—GABRIEL: *De leg.*, q. i. num. 17.—BECAN: Q. lxiv. q. 4, n° 6.—AZOR: *Justit.* moral., part. ii. lib. xi. *de* 4° *Decal. præcept.*, c. v. p. 1229, et part. iii. lib. ii. cap. 2.—DE SALAS: Quæst. xcv. tract. xiv. disp. vii. sect. 2, n. 17.—BOERIUS: *Tract de Seditiosis*, § v. in fin., &c. &c. &c.

* See cap. vi. pp. 60—68.

† Ibid. See also in Hospin. Hist. 235, the mysterious religious ceremonial for initiating Regicides!

‡ See Pasquier, Œuvres, i. 360.

General Acquaviva * was induced to make a public announcement to that effect; and matters were going on smoothly again, till the world was reminded that Mariana's book had been first ushered into the world with a license and approval from the censor appointed by this same General † Claudius Acquaviva!

The importance of this subject will more than justify the insertion of the following passage, though long, from a modern Historian of the Papacy ‡, M. Leopold Ranke, whose bias is strongly in favour of what are commonly called liberal views; and whose words will therefore be received by some with greater readiness. He is speaking of the theories of civil Government, which were propagated by Romish writers at the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth; and he might be supposed to be describing what we now see revived in the middle of the nineteenth.

"The only consideration," says he, "which the Roman Catholic principle looked to was this, where might it find its surest and strongest support? If the existing authorities were inimical to it, far was it, indeed,

* See Du Moulin's Vindication of Protestants, p. 204, folio, and Book viii. See Hospinian, p. 224.

† I have now a copy before me with this "facultas imprimendi." It had also been approved by the Provincial at Madrid. See Hospin. 219, where the approval is printed. And after all this the Book was again printed permissu superiorum in 1610. See Archbishop Laud against Fisher, sect. 38, note 2.

‡ Ranke's History of the Pope's. Ed. Lond. 1843. Translated by W. K. Kelly, Esq. Pages 176, 177.

from sparing them; nay, even from acknowledging them. It corroborated the *Irish Nation* in its spontaneous refractoriness against the *English Government;* in *England* itself, it undermined to the utmost of its power the *allegiance demanded by the Queen*, and frequently broke out into active rebellion; finally, *in France*, it confirmed its adherents in their insurrection against their legitimate Sovereign. Intrinsically, the (Romanist) religious principle in general has no special partiality for any one form of government *. During the short period of its renovation, (Roman) Catholicism displayed the most diversified inclinations: first, to the monarchical authority in Italy and Spain, and to the strengthening of feudalism in Germany; next, in the Netherlands, to the conservation of the rights of aristocratic bodies; lastly, at the close of the century, it *allied itself decidedly with the spirit of democracy.* This was the more important, since (Roman) Catholicism was now in the acme of its vigour, and the movements, in which it took part, were the most serious events of the political world in their day. Had the Popes been successful then, they would have secured for ever a paramount influence over the State. They advanced claims, their adherents and champions put forth opinions and principles, that threatened King-

* See the letter of the present General of the Jesuits in the Appendix A. to this volume.

doms and States both with internal revolutions, and with loss of independence.

"It was the *Jesuits* principally who appeared on the arena, as propounders and champions of doctrines of this sort.

"First of all, they claimed for the Church an unlimited supremacy over the State.

* * * * * * * *

"The Jesuits did not hesitate to deduce the *Princely* power from the *People*. They blended together, into one system, the theory of the Sovereignty of the People with their doctrine of the Pope's Omnipotence. Cardinal Bellarmine taught that the authority of the State is lodged in the *People*, and the People consign it sometimes to a single individual, sometimes to several; it perpetually retains the right of *changing* the forms of the government, of *retracting* its grant of authority, and *disposing* of it anew. Let it not be supposed that these are only that Author's individual views; they are, in fact, identical with the *prevailing doctrine of the Jesuit schools of those times*. In a Manual for Confessors, which obtained currency throughout the whole (Roman) Catholic world, and which had been revised by the Magister Sacri Palatii, the monarchical authority is not merely considered as subject to the Pope, in as far as the weal of souls demands; it is roundly asserted, that a King may be deposed by the *People* for tyranny, or for neglect of his duties, and another

be elected in his stead by the majority of the Nation. Francis Suarez, Professor Primarius of Theology in Coimbra, makes it his especial business, in his defence of the (Roman) Catholic Church against the *Anglican*, to expound and confirm Bellarmine's doctrine. But it is, above all, *Mariana* who elaborates with peculiar zest the idea of the *sovereignty of the People*. He suggests all the questions that could be raised on the subject, and uncompromisingly decides them in favour of the People, and to the prejudice of the Royal authority. He doubts not that a Prince may be deposed, nay, put to death, if his conduct be hurtful to religion. He pronounces an eulogium, full of pathetic declamation, on Jacques Clement, who '*after taking counsel with theologians* went and slew his King.' He is at least perfectly logical and consistent in this; these very doctrines had unquestionably kindled the fanaticism of the assassin.

"For nowhere were they promulgated with such furious violence as in France. It is impossible to meet with any thing more anti-royal than the diatribes thundered out from the pulpit by Jean Boucher. That Preacher finds centred in the Estates of the Nation the public might and majesty, the power to bind and to loose, the indefeasible sovereignty, and the judicial sway over sceptre and realm: for in them subsists the very fountain of all these; from the *People* comes the *Prince*, not by necessity and compulsion, but by free choice. He takes the same

view as Bellarmine of the relation between Church and State, and repeats the comparison of body and soul. 'One condition alone,' he says, 'limits the freedom of the popular choice: one thing alone is forbidden the people, namely, to accept a heretic King: it would thereby draw down upon it the curse of God.'

"Strange combination of ecclesiastical pretensions and democratic notions, of absolute freedom and complete subjection,—self-contradicting and anti-national,—but which yet cast an inexplicable spell over the minds of men!"

Might it not, Sir, be thought that Ranke is writing of what is displaying itself to the world in our own day?

But I now return to Pasquier, and to the passage from the Constitutions. He refers to it, and thus interprets it *:—

"With the exception of their vows, they are able to sin without sinning, when the sin is to the advantage of their Society; and this is called by them a sin committed for the glory of God; so that in the place of fear of offence, they are to feel love and desire of all perfection, and greater glory and

* Pasquier, ibid. p. 359—with a marginal reference to part vi. cap. 5, *i. e.* to the passage now in question :—

"Hormis leurs vœux, ils peuvent *pécher* sans *pécher*, quand cela se tourne au profit et utilité de leur Société; cela s'appelle en leur caballe un péché fait en l'honneur de Dieu. *Nimirum* (porte le pretexte) *ut loco timoris offensæ* &c. *consequatur.*" See here p. 46. l. 8.

praise is to redound to Christ our Creator and Lord."

It is clear, then, that in the age in which the Constitutions were written, this passage was translated exactly in the same manner as I have translated it by the Attorney-General of France. I am content to be censured with him.

But further: this very same passage has been commented on by an eminent Author of our own day. Leopold Ranke, in his History of the Popes, thus speaks, when giving an account of the establishment of the Order of the Jesuits *:—

"Here is also the other Constitution, vi. 5; according to which it seems as though *a sin could be enjoined*:—'Visum est nobis in Domino — nullas Constitutiones, declarationes, vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere, nisi superior ea in nomine Domini Jesu Christi vel in virtute obedientiæ juberet. [It has seemed good to us in the Lord—that no Constitutions, declarations, nor any order of living, can induce an *obligation to mortal or venial sin, unless* the Superior command them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of obedience.] We can hardly trust our eyes as we read this; and indeed *another* interpretation of the passage is *possible*, besides that which obviously occurs at first

* Ranke's History of the Popes. Translated by Walter Keating Kelly, Esq. Lond. 1843, p. 50.

sight. 'Obligatio ad peccatum mortale vel veniale,' may possibly rather mean, the binding force of a Constitution, such, that he who breaks the latter is guilty of one or the other kind of sin. [The passage thus interpreted would signify, That no Constitution, &c., can impose an obligation amounting in its force to the contingency of mortal or venial sin, unless the Superior command those Constitutions, &c.—*Trans.*] It will, at least, be confessed, that the Constitution ought to be more perspicuous; *no fault* can *be alleged against one* who shall bonâ fide refer 'ea' to 'peccatum mortale vel veniale,' and not to 'Constitutiones.'"

Such, Sir, is Ranke's judgment on this subject. "You see," he says, "here is a Constitution, according to which it seems as though a sin could be enjoined;" and "no fault," he adds, "can be alleged against any one who translates the passage," as Pasquier, the English Translator, and I have done; and for which I have been censured by the Reviewer.

But the Writer in the British Magazine boldly says, "*One would have thought* that any person of Dr. Wordsworth's abilities and information must have seen at a glance the *impossibility* of a man *so shrewd* as *the author* of the Constitutions, supposing the case of a Superior commanding a member of the Society to commit mortal sin in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

He has paid me, you see, a high compliment, in

placing me above M. Pasquier and M. Ranke. Nor is this all. Far from it. Let the author of the Constitutions be as "*shrewd a man*" as the Critic imagines him to be, then it is more reasonable to suppose that he will write grammatical Latin, and to translate his words accordingly. But, I add, there are two kinds of shrewdness: one that of wiliness, the other that of wisdom. I cannot allow the author of the Constitutions to have been "*a shrewd man*" in the latter sense of the word; in the former he may have been shrewd, and yet have written as I have supposed him to have done, and, as is often the case with shrewd persons of this description, have been caught in his own trap. This I show as follows.

The Constitutions, as is well known, were never intended to be published; they were to be ἀῤῥητα, or arcana; to be kept close from the world's eye*; and they are to be interpreted by us with this fact constantly in view.

The Constitutions enjoin unreserved obedience to the will of the Superior, and, whatever the Superior commands "is to be supposed to be so good, that nothing equally pleasing to God *could* be done by any one acting from his own will and judgment†;"

* Paul III., in his bull of 1549, granted to the General of the Order, that any one who published their Rules might be excommunicated and imprisoned. They were not to be shown to the novices, Declar. in Exam. c. 1. See also Regulæ Communes 38, Hospinian, Histor. Jesuit. 54.

† Sum. Const. sect. 31. Part vi. c. 1.

and a passage such as the present would have the effect of carrying out that principle, by exacting the most unscrupulous submission from the members, who were already trained to be like dry staves* and dead corpses, and to immolate their Senses, Reason and Conscience as victims to the deified Will of their Superior. Such a passage, I say, rendered as I have rendered it, might have come from the pen of an Author like him, who dictated the no less monstrous proposition, "If the Church" (of Rome) "defines to be black that which to our eyes appears to be white, we must affirm it to be black†."

It must also be carefully remembered, that the ingenuity of the most celebrated Casuists of this Society seems to have been devoted to one point, to enable men, if I may so say, to sin without sinning‡. Thus the reader of the Constitutions will see, that according to them, sin to be sin, must be *manifest*§

* Const. Part iii. c. i. and Part vi. c. i. Summar. Const., sect. 31. See also Hospinian, Hist. 68.

† Exercitia Spiritualia Ignatii Loyolæ, Tolosæ, 1593, p. 176, Reg. 13. Si quod Oculis apparet Album Ecclesia Nigrum definierit debemus quod Nigrum sit pronunciare. Ibid. Reg. 1. Sublato *omni* proprio judicio paratus semper sit animus ad obediendum Ecclesiæ.

‡ Their own boast was, (in Imago Primi Sæculi, viii. 8,) that "sins were now blotted out with much more ease than that with which they were formerly committed."

§ Const. vi. 1. ubi *definiri* non possit aliquod peccati genus intercedere; Declar. ibid. in quibus nullum *manifestum* peccatum. Summarium Const. 31. voluntatem ac judicium suum in omnibus, ubi peccatum non *cerneretur*, omninò conforment. See Bishop Barlow's Remains, p. 403.

to him who commits it, otherwise it is *no sin;* and yet they order every one to submit his senses to the Superior with "*a blind* obedience*:" so that whatever the Superior commands, however sinful it may be in itself, ceases to be sinful, by *being commanded.* From this principle of the Constitutions, arose two deadly doctrines: one, that of *Probability,* according to which it was affirmed in the Schools of the Jesuits, that if an action, however criminal, is recommended by any learned authority ("habes auctorem quo facias hoc"), it may be done without scruple; secondly, that of *Philosophical Sin,* as it is called, according to which it is taught, that if a man commits murder, but, while in the act of committing it, abstracts his mind from what he is doing and from the divine Law which forbids it, and if he fixes his thoughts intently on some *good end,* then he is not guilty of mortal sin†.

But again: it must also be remembered, that before the Constitutions were written, the Papal Bulls, which established and confirmed the Order of Jesuits, had invested the Superior with the power of *absolving* all the *members of the Order* from all *sin*‡.

* Const. vi. 1. *cæcâ* quâdam obedientiâ . . . *cæco* quodam *impetu* voluntatis . . . licet nihil aliud quam *signum* voluntatis superioris sine ullo *expresso* signo videretur . . . ac si a Christo egrederetur. See also Declarat. in Const. iii. c. 1. Examin. 3. S. 2. We see whence Bellarmine derived his plea mentioned above, p. 11.

† See the authorities in the History of the Jesuits, 245, ii. 382. Lond. 1816. Mosheim, History of the Church, Cent. xvii. sect. xxxv.

‡ See Litteræ Apostolicæ quibus variæ privilegia continentur Soc.

In the year 1549, Pope Paul III. gave this privilege to Ignatius Loyola and all future Generals, with the reservation of certain sins specified in a bull of Sixtus IV.: this privilege was confirmed and extended further* by Julius III. (in whose Pontificate, and by whose command, the Constitutions were written†), in his Brief of 1552, addressed to Ignatius; so that in fact it came to this, that the Superior might enjoin a sin, with a full assurance to the party who was commanded to commit it, that he would receive absolution from his guilt, as soon as the command was performed. This being borne in mind, the clause in question need not, I think, excite much surprise.

The consideration of such facts as these leads to the conclusion that no argument whatever can be deduced from some men's private opinions of what the Author of the Constitutions himself might think fit or expedient to *intend* or *say*. It appears to have been ever one of the most common artifices of the Order of which he was the Founder, to put forth startling propositions, such as would *not* pro-

Jesu, Antwerp, 1635, p. 39. "eidem Ignatio et aliis generalibus præpositis pro tempore existentibus," &c. &c. See also ibid. p. 50.

* Ibid. p. 73. See also ibid. 237. In a compendium of the Privileges of the Order, published at Antwerp in 1657, there is a "Faculty from the Pope to the Superior, of absolving all Jesuits from *all sin* (ab hæresi, apostasiâ, et ab omni alio *crimine*) committed for the good of the Order and the Apostolic See."

† Constitutiones scribi jussit Julius Pontifex Pauli successor. Damiani Synopsis, l. 7.

duce any revulsion in the minds of those who had been previously initiated in his esoteric discipline of self-immolation, but would rather be greedily gorged by *them*, as affording fresh food for their craving and ravenous appetite for occasions of self-abnegation, and thus minister intense gratification to the most subtle and exquisite pride with which the Evil Spirit pampers the corrupt heart of man; while at the same time these propositions, from their very monstrosity, would, they imagined, be more capable of being *repudiated* by the Order, with a semblance of virtuous indignation, and denied as incredible and impossible.

Thus, the very exorbitance of their sin would be their refuge; and they hoped to be absolved through the enormity of their crime! Besides, they reckoned also on the candour of certain writers, who would be eager and forward to display their superior sagacity and chivalrous impartiality, by affirming that such "shrewd men," such "discreet and cautious men," as the Jesuits, could never say any thing extravagant; and then the Jesuits would have a peculiar satisfaction in flattering such critics as their defenders, while they secretly derided them as their dupes.

But in writing thus, do I deny or forget that the phrase *obligare ad peccatum mortale* may be made to bear the meaning of obliging a person to do such or such an action, *under pain of being guilty* of sin,

if he does not do it? Far from it. It is forced (I say *forced*, for it could not spontaneously mean this,) to bear this signification in the passages cited by the Reviewer; and if Grammar, Reason, and Morality, will allow it to have the *same* meaning in the particular passage now before us, be it so, let it be thus interpreted *here*. Nay, let us waive all *other* considerations; and let us argue the question upon the Reviewer's own ground of *shrewdness* alone. Let us see what consequences will thence follow: how will the character of the Author of the Constitutions be affected by the adoption of the sense for which the Reviewer pleads in his behalf?

The phrase means, says the Reviewer, that "the Constitutions do not create such an obligation as to make a breach of them a sin"—even a venial sin (veniale peccatum). So, Sir, the laws of Ignatius, after all, are to be no laws at all! and this, too, after Ignatius has given the most solemn injunctions that they are to be "observed *entirely* and *universally**;" and has declared that "*perfection* is to be derived from *absolute obedience* to them all †;" and has charged the General of the Order to see that they are observed

* Perfectæ servandæ, Part vi. 1. § 1. Const. and Declar. ibid. Declar. ad Procem. universaliter observari debent. Part iv. c. 10. See also Pars x. omnes observationi Constitutionum studeant.

† Part vi. c. 1. nihil amittamus perfectionis quod divinâ gratiâ consequi possimus *in absolutâ omnium constitutionum observatione*, and Summarium, p. 12. In absolutâ Constitutione observatione nil prætermittendum.

everywhere*; and therefore those parts of them which concern each member are to be read by them once a month. And yet, after Ignatius has taken all these pains to compose these Laws and to inculcate an unqualified obedience to them; behold, suddenly, by the magic spell of a single sentence, all their authority vanishes! The breach of them has become not even a venial sin! A shrewd author this!

But this is as nothing compared with what follows: —The true meaning, says the Reviewer, of the rest of the passage is this, "No Constitutions, declarations, or rule of living, can induce such an obligation as makes obedience to them binding under pain of *mortal* or venial sin; *unless*, in any particular instance, the Superior should command the observance of *any* of *them* in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of obedience,"—and *then* the thing so commanded is to be done on pain of damnation!

So that in fact, Sir, the Laws of the Society, which just now had become no laws at all, (for their breach, we were told, involves not even venial sin,) may suddenly, by the will of a mortal man, the Superior, be impregnated with such deadly virus, and be armed with such fearful potency, that, as it were by the touch of the spring of an infernal machine, they may all at once be discharged in a

* Part ix. c. 3. ad Generalem pertinebat curare ut Societatis Constitutiones ubique observentur.

volley upon the conscience of any member of the Order, and that *any one* of them may make him guilty of *mortal* sin and involve him in the pains of damnation, if he does *not do now*, what a moment ago it was not *even* a *venial* sin *to omit!*

And this Constitution, we are told, is specially framed, in order that the members of the Society may "not fall into a *snare!*" and to encourage, as the Reviewer expresses it, "the more *free* and *generous* spirit of *love*, and *a desire* of *universal perfection!*" This then, Sir, is the sense which, with the rejection of *my* translation, the Reviewer forces on his author, by way of *defending* him!

That Ignatius did intend this, I, for one, will not take upon me to say; but he is *accused* of meaning it by his Apologist—and, I may add, by an earlier writer, I mean the English Author of the History of the Jesuits*, who founds one of his heaviest *charges* against the Order on this very passage, rendered in the same manner as that in which the *defender* of Ignatius understands it.

For my own part, my dear Sir, if it be true that

* Lond. 1816. vol. ii. p. 257. "The Constitutions inform him that they do not oblige any one in conscience, nor under pain of mortal or venial sin, except in the case of the four vows; but that if the Superior thinks fit to command any Jesuit to observe them, the obligation is *formed at once:* thus the *sin* is made to depend upon the General alone, and to vary according to persons, although the Scriptures inform us, that upon all questions of sin there is no respect of persons."

Ignatius conceived the idea of attempting to give to the Superior of his Order that tremendous power which belongs to the Almighty alone, of causing that the violation of what was no law before, should by the utterance of a single syllable, or by the intimation even of a sign, become mortal sin; assuredly, he was *not* "a shrewd author," but was guilty of monstrous sacrilege *, he was a plunderer of God's glory, an usurper of His prerogative; he was an aggressor against human conscience, that noble privilege of man, for the right use of which he will have to give a strict account at the day of doom. But, if he did *not* mean what the Reviewers impute to him, then he could not have suffered a greater injury from his bitterest foe, than that which has been now inflicted upon him by the *defence* set up in his favour, by the British Magazine, and the Dublin Review.

The practical result of what has been now said, is this. Either the Superior may command mortal sin; or, he may make *that* to be *mortal* sin which was *no* sin before. Therefore, he may make disobedience to himself to be mortal sin; and, therefore, his commands, however criminal, must be obeyed †. Now,

* Precisely what Bishop Sanderson calls *immune sacrilegium*, Prælect. iv. Prædator est gloriæ Dei, et potestatis ei debitæ, quisquis in conscientias hominum aut sibi jus arrogat aut dominatum exercet. Viderint Romani Pontifices quique illis parasitantur Canonistæ aut supparasitantur Jesuitæ, ut se hujus tam *immanis sacrilegii* crimine liberent.

† In the Memorial of the Jesuits of Spain and Portugal to Pope Clement VIII., the Superior is styled "Lord of lords, and he is said

observe, the Order of Jesuits is bound by a vow of obedience to the Pope; and the *present* Pontiff, Pius IX., as is declared by the General of the Order, Father Roothan, has never ceased to give pledges of his affection to it *. That is, he has testified his regard for a Society, governed by Constitutions, which make sin to be no sin, and by a Superior whose Will is Law. If, then, the Papacy is the Enemy of Liberty and Loyalty; if it defies all Law, human and divine; if it aims to destroy all civil Institutions, its alliance with the Order of Jesuits is perfectly intelligible; but it must not imagine that any person in his senses will believe that it has really advanced a single step in the path of civil, much less of religious, Reformation, till it tests the Obedience of the Order of Ignatius, by rescinding all its Constitutions, and by effecting its total suppression.

I am, Sir,
Yours truly, &c. &c.

to do what he wills, being bound by no law." (Dominus dominantium et facit quod vult, nullis legibus adstrictus.)

* See above, p. 42.

LETTER IV.

Nos nihil æquè offendit in Concilio Tridentino ac par honos tributus libris Canonicis, Apocryphis et non scriptis Traditionibus. Nos nihil æquè abominamur in adversariorum nostrorum scriptis ac blasphemias horrendas contra Sacram Scripturam quibus libri nonnullorum scatent, qui se dicunt Catholicos Romanos, sunt autem hæretici hæreticorum perditissimi. Ducit hodiè familiam inter hujus generis hæreticos Scioppius . . . qui verbo Dei viventis scripto minus etiam tribuit quàm sive Pighius, sive alius, qui dixit Patrum memoriâ *Scripturam si auctoritate Ecclesiæ destituatur non plus per se valere quam fabulas Æsopi;* quod blasphemum dictum postea defendere ausus est Cardinalis *Hosius*. Et Cardinalis Bellarminus, De Verbo Dei non scripto, iv. cap. iv. Scripturam suffragio Ecclesiæ carentem comparat Alcorano.

ISAAC CASAUBON, Exerc. Baron. I. xxxiii.

MY DEAR SIR,

Such are the words of Isaac Casaubon, one of the most learned and pious men who ever adorned your country. He was rightly of opinion, that the faithfulness of a Church cannot be more surely tried than by the reverence which it pays to the Holy Scriptures, and by the zeal which it shows in maintaining their honour, purity, and integrity,

and in disseminating them throughout the World. This test was applied to the Church of *Rome*, in my Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Letters to you; and it was there shown, that so far from rendering due honour to the WORD of GOD, *that* Church does much to discredit it, and render it of none effect, in various ways; *First*, by raising its own Traditions to an equal dignity with Scripture, and by obtruding them as a part of the Rule of Faith, independent of Scripture, and in opposition to it; *Secondly*, by adding more than ten books, (which *we* call Apocrypha,) which were never received by our Blessed Lord as inspired, to the Canon of the Old Testament; thus adulterating God's Word, and making its inspiration to depend on the opinions of man; *Thirdly*, by representing the Canon of the New Testament as resting solely on the suffrage of the Church, and as not fixed till the fourth or fifth century, when, it is alleged by Divines of Rome, that suffrage was given, and so the New Testament *attained* the *authority* of *an inspired book; Fourthly*, by setting up the Pope as the divinely appointed Interpreter of Scripture, and by requiring us to receive, as divine oracles, those interpretations by which he wrests the Word of God from its plain sense; *Fifthly*, by representing Scripture as imperfect, obscure, and readily allowing itself to be bent to any sense, however vicious, to which any one may wish to adapt it; *Sixthly*, as not designed or suited to be generally read by the

people; and, *Seventhly*, as speaking its true sense, not so much in the divinely inspired Hebrew and Greek Originals, as in the Latin Vulgate Translation, which the Church of Rome imposes on all, as the authentic Standard of Holy Writ.

Such, as is shown in my Letters, is the treatment which Holy Scripture has received at the hands of the Church of *Rome*. All who believe these charges against her to be true, must, by necessary consequence, confess that she has been guilty of great faithlessness with respect to *that* most important duty of a Church, the guardianship and interpretation of the Word of God; and, since Scripture is the Voice of the Holy Spirit Himself to men, it cannot be denied, that irreverent disparagement of it, and all tampering with its contents and corruption of them, is nothing less than sin against the Holy Ghost; and that, if the Church of *Rome has* so dealt with Holy Writ, and continues so to deal with it, then she has been guilty, and is guilty of this sin; and that, therefore, she ought to repent of her iniquities, and to reform her teaching and her practice; and that all her members, instead of defending and abetting her in these her sins, ought to pray and labour for her amendment.

The Dublin Reviewer has had all these assertions before him in my Letters; and he does not, and cannot, impugn any of them; and as if to make his acknowledgment of these charges more remarkable

and conclusive, he takes from the middle of my argument the following passage, which, though not essential to my main assertions, will, when examined, afford abundant fresh material for their corroboration.

As a specimen of the irreverent language used by the Church of Rome concerning Holy Scripture, I wrote thus:—

"Vain is the labour," said Cardinal Hosius, a Papal legate and president at the Council of Trent, "which is spent on Holy Scripture, for Scripture is but a creature and a beggarly element." And Ludovicus, a canon of the Lateran, in a speech at the same Council, "Scripture is only lifeless ink." And Pighius, in his third book of Controversies, calls it "a mute judge, a *nose of wax*, which allows itself to be pulled this way and that, and to be moulded into any form you please."—p. 74.

On this passage in my Letters, the Dublin Reviewer comments as follows:—

Will Dr. Wordsworth say that these expressions are used in contempt of Scripture, or that their authors undervalued the holy writings, and ridiculed their contents? If he cannot, or dare not, what do these expressions prove against those who used them, or the Church whose devoted children they were? If Hosius, Ludovicus, and Pighius, were irreverent men and trifled with holy things, or wrote about what they did not understand, such language coming from them is liable to grave censure; it will prove nothing for Dr. Wordsworth's purpose to cite these and like sayings, unless he can also show the writers to have been influenced by a spirit of irreverence, which he so deliberately insinuates against them.

First, we begin with Pighius. He wrote thus:—

"But there is no passage of Scripture so plain or clear as to defend itself from the wrong-dealings of heretics, who adulterate, wrest, and pervert the Scriptures to their own sense. For these are—as some one no less truly than wittily observed—like a nose of wax, which may be twisted every way; and like a leaden rule, which is made to bend to what shape one pleases. To these (the Scriptures) we must apply not a rule of lead and one equally flexible, but one strong and unbending, that column, that foundation of the truth, I mean the common understanding and sentence of the Catholic Church."—Lib. iii. c. 3.

Does this sound like contempt? Is it not clear, that to the heretics, and to their treatment of Scripture, the expression is to be applied, and not to the estimation in which Pighius held the sacred writings? We are even confident enough to ask Dr. Wordsworth himself, whether he can find fault with the expression now: we are certain of this, the High Anglican party will adopt the whole passage readily.

Ludovicus is the next. Dr. Wordsworth does not give any reference to the place where his words may be found, which leaves us to suppose that he has taken his quotations on the authority of another; we have been at the pains to find them*, and shall now present them with their context:—

"That I may pass by that most important and clear saying of blessed Paul, in which he warned the Thessalonians and others who practised Christian piety, to stand to and hold fast, not the writings, not the volumes, not the books, but 'the traditions which they had learned, whether by word of mouth or by writing.' For that holy teacher,

* Colet. Concil. tom. xx. col. 1143.

who had been taken up into the third heaven, and heard secret words which no man may speak, knew that the Church of God was the living breast of Christ, but the Scripture, as it were, dead ink—*quasi mortuum atramentum*—and therefore we must rather believe the living breast than dead ink; that is, greater faith is to be given to the living Church than to books, which, in themselves, are as dead things. He knew, too, that Christ did not leave books, writings, instruments, or muniments to His disciples, but examples, precepts, ways of life, and commandments." And a little further on, he speaks of the "books of divine authority."

Does this sound as if Ludovicus disregarded Scripture? On the contrary, it could have been written only by one most jealous for its due veneration, and the preservation of its uncorrupted sense.

Hosius comes next in our order, and the charge against him we dispose of by saying, that Dr. Wordsworth has cited as his words, what Hosius really considers the heretics to say to their new teachers. Hosius introduces the words with this preface: "They have begun to have such thoughts as these: How long shall we endure this tyranny of these apostate monks?" *Excucullatorum istorum tyrannidem.* Soon after these words occur those cited by Dr. Wordsworth, who might have seen, if he had not been purposely blind, that Hosius is not answerable for the sentence he quotes from him; for in the margin of the very edition he has used are these words, *hæreticorum argumenta ridicula.*

The great Cardinal has furnished Dr. Wordsworth with much matter for condemnation. His words are alleged, separated from their context, and made to bear a substantive meaning, when they are used only in relation to others. He has dealt as unfairly by him as he would do who

should say, that we attributed divine honours to the queen, because we speak of her as "her majesty."

What, you will now ask, have I to say to this? You will first observe, that all the persons mentioned in the above quotation from my Letters, were men of great eminence and dignity in the Church of Rome; and that, therefore, their language may be fairly regarded as *hers*. The first of them, *Albert Pighius*, born in 1490, was patronized by four Popes, Leo X., Adrian VI., Clement VII., and Paul III.: both his books* from which I quote, are dedicated to a Pope, Paul III.; and he was employed on confidential embassies by the Roman See, and was regarded at Rome as one of the greatest Divines of his age.

Cardinal *Hosius* (or Hosen) was born at Cracow, in Poland, in the year 1504, trained at Padua, and at Bologna, raised to the see of Warmia, the principal Church of Poland, created a Cardinal by Pius IV. in 1561, and one of the Pope's Legates at the Council of Trent, and made Grand Penitentiary of Rome by Gregory XIII. He spent the last years of his life at Rome, where he died in 1579. He is called by Bayle†, "the greatest man that Poland ever produced," and was regarded as the most learned

* Controversiarum publicarum in comitiis Ratisbonensibus—the preface is dated Coloniæ, Jan. 1542, and De Hierarchiâ Ecclesiasticâ, dated 1538, the edition from which I quote is Col. 1558.

† Bayle, art. Hosius.

Theologian in the Romish Church, of his age, and honoured with the most eulogistic titles * as such; and his works on divinity were in so much repute, that one of them is said to have passed † through thirty editions in his lifetime.

Ludovicus was a Canon of the Lateran at Rome; and his speech, from which my extract is made, was sent to the Council of Trent; and he was thanked for it by one of the Papal Legates of that Council, Cardinal Gonzaga ‡.

Pighius, therefore, Hosius, and Ludovicus, were, as the Reviewer calls them, "devoted children of the Church of Rome;" they were among the most honoured of her sons; and their words express the sentiments of their Mother; and if they have spoken irreverently and profanely concerning Holy Scripture, the guilt is not only on their heads, but on hers.

* See the words of his biographer, Stanislaus Rescius, De Transitu et Morte Card. Hosii. Hosii Opera, tom. ii. p. 493. ed. Col. 1584. Alii columnam Ecclesiæ vocant, alii ornamentum Collegii Cardinalitii, splendorem Curiæ Romanæ, alii Phœnicem Cardinalium, alii Polonicum Patriarcham, alii senem verè Abrahamicum, alii malleum hæreticorum, alii nostri temporis Augustinum, alii alterum Poloniæ Stanislaum, novum Bessarionem, Melchisedechicum sacerdotem, nunquam satis laudatum Ecclesiæ defensorem, rectæ fidei custodem vigilantissimum, orbis miraculum, patrem patratum, Romani senatus ornamentum, Apostolicæ sedis propugnaculum, Christi fortissimum athletam, formidabilem hæreticorum adversarium.

† His Confessio Catholica fidei Christianæ. This is asserted by his biographer Rescius (Reszka), in his Life, published at Rome, in 1587.

‡ Labbe, Concilia, xiv. 1858—1876.

I am very reluctant to unveil the profaneness contained in their works; but the Reviewer challenges me in these words: "Will Dr. Wordsworth say that their authors undervalued the holy writings?" and he implies that "I cannot, or dare not" do so. I am obliged to reply, that they undervalued—but *undervalued* is far too weak a word, they profanely and blasphemously *desecrated* them. Yes, and acting by their hands, the Church of Rome has sacrilegiously outraged the divine honour of Scripture. This is the point to be proved; and as the Reviewer has called upon me to produce evidence of the fact, I proceed to give it.

The Psalmist says, that "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul, and that His testimony is sure, making wise the simple*;" and St. Paul praises St. Timothy for having known the Scriptures from a *child*†; and thus teaches us, that the Scriptures may be sufficiently and profitably understood by all, of every age, who read them with a humble and teachable spirit; but Pighius‡ asserts, that "they are often very obscure, and allow themselves to be drawn easily to opposite directions, and to be eluded by crafty expositions."

Again, St. Paul teaches us that the Scriptures are "able to make us wise unto salvation, that the man

* Ps. xix. 7. † 2 Tim. iii. 15.

‡ The original words of Pighius will be found given at full length in the Appendix B.

of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works*;" and St. Peter says, that not the Scriptures, but certain things in them, are "hard to be understood," and that not *any one* but "they that are *unlearned* and *unstable*," nor even they without torturing and *racking*, that is, doing violence to their plain meaning, and to the will and design of the Divine Author of the Scriptures, "wrest the Scriptures unto their own destruction†;" but the Roman Divine, the envoy of the Pope, Albert Pighius, dares to affirm, in a tone of wretched scurrility, that "the Scriptures are, as it were, a leaden and Lesbian rule, and *easily* suffer themselves to be accommodated to the sense which any one has preconceived; and that they are, as was said, not less truly than wittily, a nose of wax, which allows itself *easily* to be bent this way and that, and follows willingly which way you pull it; so they suffer themselves to be twisted and drawn, and pulled even to opposite senses, and to be adapted to any thing you please, unless you apply the inflexible rule, the authority and common sense of the tradition of the Church;" by which he always means, as he himself declares, the Tradition of the Church of *Rome;* and as if this was not enough, he says, that "the Scriptures are *easily* applied to any *impious* opinion."

"This Tradition," says he, "is the very Rule of truth and piety, *more* efficacious than Holy Writ."

* 2 Tim. iii. 7. † 2 Pet. iii. 16.

St. Peter declares that the "holy men of God" who wrote Scripture, "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*;" and St. Paul instructs us that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of GOD," and, as such, has authority from Him, and Him alone. We know, indeed, from Scripture, that it is the office of the Christian Church to deliver to us Scripture, and to guard it securely; but that the authority of Scripture is no more *derived* from the Church, than the authority of a royal message depends on the Herald who proclaims it, or on the trumpet by which it is sounded. Therefore, we ask the Church of Rome, as the Apostle asked that of Corinth, "What! came the Word of GOD out from *you?* or came it to you alone†?" But in defiance of all this, Pighius thus writes; "*All* the authority of the Gospels *depends* on that of the Church; and the authority of the Church is greater and more notable than that of Scripture; and the Church" (by which he means the Pope and the Church of Rome) "*imparted* canonical authority to the principal Scriptures, that is, to the writings of the Gospel, which authority they did not possess either from themselves, or from their authors; and the Church *preserved* to other Scriptures the authority they had from their writers; and thus, through the Church alone and her authority, we now believe all Scripture."

* 2 Pet. i. 21. † Εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους. 1 Cor. xiv. 36.

Thus Scripture is made a mere creature of the Pope, and depends on him for its preservation!

Again: our Lord teaches us that men err, not knowing the Scriptures *; but Pighius affirms, that questions of faith are not to be referred to Scripture, "because Scripture is a dumb judge;" and that the Scriptures "were not written to guide our faith, but to be subject to it."

We believe and know that Scripture may be, and has been often "wrested by unlearned and unstable men, to their own destruction;" and Scripture itself teaches us, that the Church is the pillar and ground of truth †, the spouse and body of Christ ‡; and that He has promised to give her the Holy Spirit, to teach her all things §, to guide her into all truth, and to be ever present with her, even to the end; that we must not believe every spirit ‖, and that no prophesyings or teachings of Scripture are of any private interpretation ¶; that, therefore, though private persons and particular Churches have erred in interpreting Scripture, and in deriving doctrines from it, yet, that great respect is due to the public voice of the Universal Church in her Creeds; and that whatever doctrine is new, and can be shown to have been unknown to the Church of Christ *from*

* Mark xii 24. † 1 Tim. iii. 15.
‡ Eph. v. 24—29; Col. i. 18.
§ John xiv. 26; xvi. 13; Matt. xxviii. 20.
‖ 1 John iv. 1. ¶ 2 Pet. i. 20.

the beginning, cannot be the *true sense* of Scripture, and is not to be imposed on any one as an Article of Faith.

Therefore, my dear Sir, we do most solemnly protest against the doctrine of *Rome*, as enounced in the words of Pighius, that Scripture is to be interpreted according to the current practice and teaching of the changing Church of Rome; this, we hold, is derogatory to the Church of Christ, and to Her Divine Head, and we are sure that this would be to *force* Scripture to be, indeed, "a nose of wax," "a leaden rule flexible to ill."

Further, Sir, we believe with St. Peter, that *all* St. Paul's Epistles are *Scripture* *, that is, are the Word of God; and that God has designed what He performs, and that He performs what He designs. We believe, therefore, that St. Paul's Epistles, dictated by the Holy Spirit, and publicly read in the Church, were dictated to be so read †; but Pighius ventures to affirm, that St. Paul's Epistles were not written for the Church at large, and specially, he says, "it is evident that the Epistle of Philemon was not written to be read in the Church!"

Such, Sir, is the language of *Albert Pighius* concerning Scripture. We need no other weapon to confound such teachers as this, than that which our Blessed Lord Himself used against the Tempter,—

* 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. † Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27.

"the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God *."

Let us pass now to the speech sent from Rome by *Ludovicus*, Canon of the Lateran, to the Council of Trent, and honoured with a laudatory acknowledgment in 1562 by a President of that assembly, a Cardinal of the Church of Rome †.

"The Church of God," (by which the writer means the existing Church of Rome,) says he ‡, "is the living breast of Christ; but Scripture is as it were lifeless ink; and, therefore, it is far better to trust the living breast than the lifeless ink; that is, we must rather trust the living Church, than, so to speak, lifeless Manuscripts."

Thus he seeks to set the Scriptures and the Church at variance with each other, as the Jews endeavoured to make a strife between Moses and Christ; and he would have us believe the Church of *Rome* rather than the Word of God, though we are sent in Scripture "to the Law and the Testimony §," and are taught that, if any "speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them;" and we are to try the spirits by it; and the Bereans are praised for searching the Scriptures daily, whether the things preached to them were so ‖; and St.

* Eph. vi. 17.

† Labbe's Concilia, xiv. p. 1858—1876.

‡ For the original words of Ludovicus, see Appendix C.

§ Is. viii. 20.

‖ Acts xvii. 11.

Paul teaches us, that "if any one, or even an angel from heaven, preach to us any thing beside what he preached," and the Church received from him, "he is to be accursed *."

Yet, notwithstanding this, and though the same Apostle asserted that "all Scripture is given by God, and is able to make us wise unto salvation, that we may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works †;" the orator of the Council of Trent dares to palm upon St. Paul the following sentiment; "The Apostle knew that Christ did not give and bequeath parchment scraps, quires of foolscap, and paper shreds ‡, nor writings and evidences, to His disciples, but examples and precepts;" as if the Scriptures of the New Testament were not the legacy of Christ to the Church!

Again: although the Gospel was *written* for the express purpose, that the primitive Christian Church, which had the benefit of the oral teaching even of the Apostles, "*might know* the certainty of those things in which it had been instructed by word of mouth §," yet the same Roman divine ventures to say, that St. Paul "*knew* that traditions and pious customs *cannot be corrupted* and adulterated, *but* that the sacred Scriptures, although of Divine authority, may not only be corrupted and adulterated, but that their

* Gal. i. 8. † 2 Tim. iii. 17.
‡ Membranulas, chartulas, macrocola—contemptuous terms.
§ Luke i. 4.

words and sentiments, although good and perfect in themselves, may be wrested in contrary directions, according to the temper and habits of individuals."

"O that the subverters of ancient discipline," he exclaims, "would ponder these things! Then, perhaps, they would interpret the holy Gospels and sacred books not according to the written letter, but conformably to the general assent and consent of the whole Church (*i. e.* the Church of *Rome*), in which we cannot err, and in which there can be no degeneracy or sin; and according to her common *custom*, in obedience to which it is lawful sometimes to *rescind and abrogate the laws* themselves."

You see, Sir, that the speaker recommends the very practice of the Pharisees, which was so solemnly condemned by our Blessed Lord, Who said, "Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men;" "Ye make the Word of God of none effect by your traditions*;" and Who now says to the Papal Rabbis, "Ye annul the law of God, to follow the *custom* of Rome."

But hear the Dublin Reviewer. The passage quoted from Ludovicus "could have been written only by one most jealous for the due veneration of Scripture, and the preservation of its uncorrupted sense."

I abstain from offering any comment on these

* Mark vii. 8. 13. Matt. xv. 2. 6. 9.

words, and pass to Cardinal Hosius; and I must begin with thanking the Reviewer for pointing out and correcting my error, in ascribing to Hosius what is written by him in the name of an adversary. It may not be of much interest to you, or to any one, to know how this error arose; but, in order that you may not imagine that I had any desire to injure the memory of Hosius, I may be permitted to mention, that the tenor of the treatise from which the passage is taken, is so much in harmony with the passage itself, that I did not perceive that Hosius in this place was speaking in another man's person, and not his own.

Let me also add, as a somewhat remarkable fact, and as showing that the passage in question was very liable to be so misapprehended, that instead of the words cited by the Reviewer, as standing in the margin, *hæreticorum argumenta ridicula,* (which were added in later editions,) the following are placed *by the side of the passage* in the earlier copies; for instance, in one now before me of 1562 (p. 242, F.). "A Deo nos doctos et non solum legis aut Scripturæ peritos esse oportet."—p. 93. "We ought to be taught of God, and not only to be skilled in the Law and the Scripture." Who, my dear Sir, would not suppose that this was the Cardinal's own sentiment, and that the text, to which it is the gloss, expressed his own sense? He says, "oportet," you see, and quotes the Psalms in sup-

port of what he says; as if to appropriate the sentiment to himself. What wonder, then, if the words in the text should be imputed to him, especially since they are in accordance with the scope of his whole Treatise, which is to show that our faith must not be based on Scripture, but on the teaching and practice of the Church of Rome?

What wonder, let me add, that these words *were* actually imputed to him by many of the most eminent writers of his day? This very passage is quoted, as expressing the Cardinal's *own* sentiments by Bishop Jewell*, in his celebrated Apology; and when Harding censured the Bishop for this, Jewell showed that it had been understood and quoted as conveying the Cardinal's own sense by numerous other writers; and this same passage which I have quoted from Hosius now stands in all the editions of Bishop Jewell's Apology, with the following note attached to it†. "Thus Hosius, in his book concerning the Express Word of God, but shrewdly, and in the person of another, although he clearly affirms the same thing himself, in other places, and in the same book."

I cannot quit this passage without expressing my conviction, derived from examining the Cardinal's

* See the words of Bp. Jewell, in Appendix D.

† Page 108. Hæc Hosius in libro de Expresso Verbo Dei, sed astutè, et sub alterius personâ, quamvis et ipse alias eadem in eodem etiam libro disertis verbis affirmet.

works, in different editions, that he learnt much from the discussions and controversies with the Reformers in which his life was spent; he is more sober in his language concerning Scripture than most of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries of the Church of Rome; and in his *later* editions he is still more cautious than in the former*.

But, my dear Sir, you must now allow me to add, that it is precisely in such writers as Hosius, that we see most clearly the radical errors of the *Church* to which he belonged. Hosius *would have been* one of the greatest luminaries of Christendom, in his own age, if he had been brought up in a Church (such as I do not hesitate to call the Church of *England*), which builds her faith on Scripture alone, and receives no article of doctrine as necessary to Salvation, but such as can be proved from Scripture; and which, because she reverences Scripture as the Rule of Faith, will not permit any *new interpretations* of Scripture to be obtruded upon her *as Scripture;* for she well knows that if she did, she would be *adding* to Scripture, or detracting from it, and thus Scripture would *cease* to be her *Rule of Faith;* but not neglecting the divine gifts of Reason and of Learning, she looks for her guidance to *that* Interpreter of Scripture, which Christ Himself, the Divine Author

* An interesting sketch of the life of the great Cardinal will be found in Krasinsky's History of the Reformation in Poland, vol. i. p. 400. Lond. 1838.

of Scripture, has appointed for the exposition of Scripture—not the Pope of Rome, with his arrogant allegories*, nor the present Church of Rome with her degenerate teaching and corrupt practice, nor to any particular Church in Christendom—but to the *Catholic Church* in and from the days of Christ and the Blessed Apostles, and in its public teaching and practice reads, as in a mirror, the reflexion of the Written Word; and will not therefore receive as the sense of Scripture any of those twelve Articles of the Trent Creed which were not known to the Church of Christ, "the Pillar and Ground of Truth," in the days of the Holy Apostles, nor for many centuries after them.

But, unhappily, Hosius was brought up in a Church which founds her doctrinal system on *two* false principles; *first*, that Scripture alone is not the Rule of Faith, but requires the addition of oral traditions; and, *secondly*, that the interpretation of Scripture is to be derived not from the constant teaching and practice of the *universal* Church from the beginning, but from the current practice of the Church of *Rome*.

No ability, no learning, no piety in the world—and Hosius, my dear Sir, was, I believe, as eminent for these graces as the system under which he lived would allow—could avail anything against these two

* Of which see examples in Letters to M. Gondon, pp. 140—142.

false principles. He struggled in vain against them; you may see their noxious consequences in every page of his works. In reading them,—recommended as they are by beauty of style, and by piety of intention,—I seem to behold the unhappy Priest, whose sufferings have been immortalized by the Poet * and the Sculptor, striving in vain to extricate himself from the folds of the two serpents which have twisted themselves about his limbs, and are strangling him to death; and I look upon him with heartfelt sorrow, and wish he had been born in another age, and trained in another school.

But to *us* the example of Hosius is full of instruction: charitable allowances are to be made for *him*, trained as he was at Padua, a Bishop at Warmia, a Legate at Trent, a confessor in Italy, the favourite of Popes, the oracle of Rome. Besides, he was alarmed by the distractions produced by the anabaptistical principle of private interpretation, which set all public judgment of the Christian Church at defiance; and he saw so many persons of no learning or wisdom setting up themselves to dictate to the world as if they were Popes, and he thought that there was no choice but between one Pope or a thousand. But *our* case is very different: we have the advantage of studying calmly the controversies of his age, and of reaping benefit from them; we have seen the pernicious re-

* Laocoon; Virgil. Æn. ii. 201.

sults of the two opposite and false systems, in one of which there is a Pope for every man, and in the other every man is a Pope for himself: Scripture is open to us, and the history of the primitive Church, and the works of the earliest Christian Fathers, which to him were almost sealed books.

For this reason, and not in any feeling of disrespect to so eminent a man, I proceed to show briefly from his writings * the results of the two false principles which vitiated his whole teaching. "The Apostles," says he, "wrote little and delivered much without writing, that is, by oral tradition;" "Scripture is not to be regarded as the Word of God, except so far as it is confirmed by the authority of the Church, and it may be † affirmed, even in a pious sense, that if Scripture was not authorized by the Church, it would not have more validity than the fables of Æsop; for unless the Church taught us that Scriptures are canonical, they would have very little weight." Again: "Scripture contains much which may be drawn to any sense, which any one preconceives." Scripture therefore is imperfect, and needs the aid of oral tradition and a living interpreter: that tradition is the tradition of Rome, and that interpreter is the Pope: it is heretical

* The original words of Hosius, which are translated in this letter, will be found in the Appendix E. The edition from which I quote is that of Cologne, 1584.

† This was not said originally by Hosius himself.

to deny that "the right of interpreting Scripture belongs to him;" that man, as he expresses it, "is a *Satanist who* is *not* a *Papist.*" Hence, therefore, the decrees of the Pope are equal to Scripture; and the current practice of the Church of Rome becomes the Rule of Faith; and the Cardinal says, "Though a man understands not the words of Scripture, yet *if* he utters them in the sense of the Church (of Rome), he utters the express Word of God;" and if "he differs from the sense of the Church (of Rome), then, though he brings forth the balance of the sanctuary, (i. e. the Scripture,) he may indeed quote the word of the Devil, but he cannot quote the Word of God." Hence he teaches, that "Love saves even without a knowledge of Scripture"—as if Love to God were not proved by love of His Word *, and "that they who do not understand what is said by the Priest, have often more devotion than they who do,"—as if the supposed devotion of the one were due to their ignorance, or the alleged indevotion of the other to their intelligence; and as if the devout would not become more devout by the right use of the Divine gift of understanding.

What, Sir, are the other consequences of his two false principles? He forgets, that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning,

* John viii. 47: "He that is of God, heareth God's words." Ps. cxix. 97: "Lord, what love have I unto Thy Law: all the day long is my study in it."

that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope*." He forgets that Scripture was given to be read openly in the Church†; that the Apostles order their writings to be so read; and command that all who do not obey the injunctions given in those writings be avoided: he forgets that these writings were so read by the Church in and from the time in which they were written; and that Translations were made of the New Testament for the use of all the Churches, as Translations had been made, before the Christian era, of the Old‡; one of which Versions, that of the Septuagint, is employed by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, and thus the *principle* of *Vernacular* Scriptures is approved and hallowed by God Himself; and yet Cardinal Hosius, the Papal Legate at Trent, the grand Penitentiary of Rome, ventures to say, that because Versions of Scripture are not free from blemishes," (i. e. because they are not the Divine Originals,) "they have done great injury to the Church, and that the desire of understanding every thing in Scripture has produced the same evils as the eating of the forbidden fruit!"

* Rom. xv. 4.

† Joshua viii. 34. Prov. xxviii. 9: "He that turneth his ear from hearing the Law, even his prayer shall be an abomination." Acts xv. 21. See also the passages in Letters to M. Gondon, p. 82, 83.

‡ Nehem. viii. 7, 8: "The Levites caused the people to understand the Law... They read in the Book in the Law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading."

And what, Sir, is the great evil of which he complains? "I groan," says he, "over the results of these Translations of Scripture into the vernacular tongue. Some now begin to say; 'I am bound to be the pastor of my own soul, and to take the care of it; and, if I commit a sin, my Bishop will not suffer for me the pains of hell;' and is this," he asks, "agreeable to the Word of God?"

On the other hand, what is the faith which he commends? The Collier's faith. You know, my dear Sir, what that was; if not, you may hear from Hosius himself.

"Nothing is more dangerous than to contend with Satan from *Scripture.*" The Cardinal forgot that our Great Exemplar, by *not* exercising His *miraculous* power against the Evil One, at His Temptation, but by encountering Him with *Scripture,* taught *us* by His own practice, that the Devil *is* to be encountered with this weapon; and that all who are baptized and mortify their appetites, are able, by God's grace, to vanquish him with it. "Learn hence," says the Greek Father* very well, "how profitable Scripture is; for with *it* Jesus Christ stopped the mouth of the Wicked One."

But what course does Hosius prescribe? "In contests with the Evil One, especially at the last hour, it will be safest to follow the example of the

* Theophylact. in Matt. iv. p. 21, ed. Benedict.

Collier, who being asked what his faith was, repeated the Creed; and when further interrogated, replied, I believe what the Church believes. But what does the Church believe? It believes what I believe; and no other answer would he give. This example is to be followed." Albert Pighius, who recounts the same story, and from whom Hosius seems to have transcribed it, informs us that this Collier had "no explicit or definite understanding of the faith of the Church*:" so that a mere repetition by rote of a certain form of words—Latin words not understood—and an implicit belief in all that the Church of Rome teaches, is commended as the most efficacious means for conquering Satan at the hour of death!

To such an end would the teaching of this great Cardinal conduct those committed to his charge!

Some, perhaps, who read these pages may think that after such specimens of unscriptural and antiscriptural doctrine, I have spoken too favourably of Hosius. They will allow me, I hope, to remind them of the great difficulties and privations to which he was subject, through the unhappy temper and cruel practice of the Church to which he belonged. She was, indeed, a hard taskmistress; she exacted severe

* De Hierarch. p. 27. "De Ecclesiæ tamen fide nihil habens definiti ac expliciti." The Creed repeated by the Collier was not the Trent Creed: for Pighius says that he heard the story when he was a boy; that is, many years before the *present* Creed of the Church of Rome was made.

service from her children, and kept them in abject bondage. Hosius himself, caressed and honoured by her, and imbued with feelings of profound reverence for her authority, loaded with her dignities, and seated on high in her conclaves, and regarding her teaching as infallible, has left behind him in a letter to a friend, a brother Cardinal, expressions of sorrow, and even indignation, for the tyrannical bigotry with which the Church of Rome closed the avenues of light and knowledge against her children.

"I am glad *," says he, "to hear that my work is being printed at Rome by Paul Manutius. I hear there was a great discussion concerning a passage in it from Gregory Nyssen, whether it should be expunged from my book, or allowed to remain; and I see you have followed a middle course; you have neither tolerated nor erased the whole, but you have allowed the former part of it to remain, and have cancelled all the remainder, which *was most to the purpose.*"

So that we see the writings of a Father of the Church, and the work of a Papal Legate, a President at Trent, were not allowed by the Roman Inquisitors to pass without emendation.

But what follows is still more striking:—

"Often, when I was at Rome," (says the Cardinal,) "I used to deplore this misery of ours, and so much

* See the original words in Appendix F.

68067

the more, because, when I was desirous of purchasing the works of the four principal Doctors of the Church, (St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Athanasius, and St. Chrysostom,) I was informed by the Bookseller that he was not allowed to sell them, because there was an *Edict* of the *Pope* to the contrary."

Verily, "the Law had perished from the Priest, and counsel from the ancients *."

Reflect, Sir, a moment on this: the works of the greatest lights of the Church prohibited by him who calls himself the Vicar of Christ! Think, I say, of this;—the writings of the most holy and learned Christian Fathers could not be purchased at Rome by one who became a Bishop, a President at the infallible Council of Trent, and the Grand Penitentiary of the Roman Church!

This was too much for Hosius himself. "I was stung with indignation," he says; "and I exclaimed in bolder language, perhaps, than *the times would bear*, What! may heretics have weapons," (he had been speaking before of the editions of the Fathers published by the Protestants at Basle,) "and may Catholics have none? Why do we not labour that the books which the heretics have corrupted, may be corrected by us? If forged money is in circulation, the true is not therefore called in; but *now all coin*

* Ezek. vii. 26.

is interdicted. We coin nothing ourselves. We are forbidden *to have any intercourse* with the Fathers of the Church!" "Such language," says the Cardinal, "was wrung from me by just indignation; and many heard it. And now I would ask your Lordship, whence come those Magdeburgh Centuries, which you mention in your letter to me, but from the labour which the heretics (Protestants) have devoted to the study and publication of the works of the Fathers, which they see are *wholly neglected by us*, who by God's grace are Catholics?"

"Many there were," he adds, "of late years, who read nothing but Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus, and what is more to be lamented, did not even think the Bible worth a careful perusal."

Again, in the year 1572, he writes from Italy: "Divines of Paris, who have come hither, cannot find words to express their astonishment that there is such a dearth of sacred books at Rome*."

Such are the confessions of the great Hosius: let the Cardinal, therefore, be judged charitably, since he was born and bred in Egyptian bondage, and yet had a longing desire for the light and liberty of a better country; and since he thus shows what he

* Mr. Mendham observes in his Life of Pope Pius V. (p. 172), printed only fifteen years ago, that "there is not, he believes, a single edition *to the present day* of the Originals either of the Old or of the New Testament Scriptures in their own languages, Hebrew and Greek, printed in the city which boasts to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches."

would have been if he had lived in a happier land. But what, Sir, are we to think of the *Church* which enslaved his noble spirit, and, by the voice of her chief Pontiff, denied him access to the works of the holiest writers of Christendom? Is it not clear, that if the Church of Rome could have had her will,—however she may honour the names of the Fathers, as the Pharisees built the tombs of the prophets murdered by their ancestors—the works of Chrysostom and Athanasius, of Ambrose and Augustine, would have been destroyed by her; and that, as far as in her lay, she has actually destroyed them; and that if we now possess some editions of the works of the Christian Fathers, as we do, from members of her communion, especially the learned Benedictines, this is not due to *her*, but rather to the spirit of inquiry, which it pleased the Providence of God to diffuse through the world by the agency of those whom He raised up to heal her, if she would be healed?

Is it not also evident, that she is conscience-smitten with a desperate feeling of her own falseness; or, if her conscience is seared, is convicted of it by her own acts, in thus shrinking from the light; and in endeavouring to blind men's eyes, that they may not see her guilt?

Is it not also plain, that the errors of Hosius are the sins of Rome? that his expressions of disparagement and irreverence towards Scripture lie at her door? and that until she renounces and forsakes her

sins, the members of her communion will never be *able* to teach the truth as it is taught in Scripture; nor to speak and write of Scripture in that spirit of veneration which is due to the Word of God?

On the whole, then, it is clear, and the more it is examined, the more manifest it will appear, that the Church of Rome, speaking by the mouth of her doctors, whom the Popes have delighted to honour, has treated the Word of God as if it were her creature and her slave, and as if it were no better than wax to be moulded in her hands into any form she pleases, and has thus convicted herself of sin against the Holy Spirit, Who spake by the Prophets, and descended in tongues of fire on the heads of the Apostles.

And what, Sir, in the last place, are we to think of that unhappy temper which, with all this evidence before it, and with all the advantages derived from the discussions of the sixteenth century, instead of endeavouring to *remove* the radical errors in the Romish system from which the irreverent expressions quoted in this letter flow, takes upon itself the office of *defending* these expressions, and thus involves itself in guilt, which, we would fain charitably hope, their authors themselves, if now living, would not have incurred?

Permit me to express an earnest hope, that you, my dear Sir, and that even those who have ventured to offer an apology for these expressions of Pighius,

Ludovicus, and Hosius, may be endued with a nobler and holier spirit, and may henceforth devote their endeavours to restore Scripture to that Supremacy which is now usurped by the Pope, and may thus obtain a blessing from Him Whose Word Scripture is, and Who will judge us by it at the Great Day.

I am, Sir, &c.

LETTER V.

Mala Consuetudo sine Veritate vetustas est erroris.—TERTULLIAN.

Non hominis Consuetudinem sed Dei veritatem sequi oportet.—CYPRIAN.

Nemo Consuetudinem Veritati præponat, Veritate manifestatâ, cedat Consuetudo Veritati.—AUGUSTIN.

Non dixit Dominus, Ego sum Consuetudo, sed Veritas.—GREGORIUS MAG.

MY DEAR SIR,

The present Letter will afford a practical illustration of the preceding one. In the last it was shown that the Church of Rome, instead of regulating her practice by Scripture, would bend Scripture to her practice; and instead of interpreting Scripture by the constant teaching and usage of the Church of Christ from the beginning, would make it vary with the fickle caprice of her own will.

Of this she has given a remarkable proof, as follows.

Our Blessed Lord, when He instituted the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, administered the Bread

and Wine to His Disciples. He said, "Take, eat:" He said also, "Drink ye all of this*." If any explanation were necessary of this plain command, we have it in the declaration of Holy Scripture, that "they *all* drank of it†;" and we have it in the contemporary and uninterrupted practice of the Church for many successive centuries, in which the cup as well as the bread was administered to all the communicants. The Church of *Rome* herself, for a thousand years and more after Christ, administered *both* kinds. But gradually she withdrew the cup from all but the Priest who administers; till at length, at the Council of Constance, on the 15th of June, 1415, she enacted, that "although Christ administered in both kinds, and although the Eucharist was received‡ by

* Matt. xxvi. 26, 27. "The Apostles," say Romish Divines, "were all *priests* and not laymen; and therefore communicated in *both kinds*." It is scarcely necessary to notice this objection, except for the sake of observing, that, according to the practice and law of the Church of Rome, Christ *alone*, the *celebrant*, would have communicated in both kinds; and the *Apostles* would not have been allowed to receive in more than *one kind*. See the next note but one.

† Mark xiv. 23.

‡ Concil. Constant. Sess. xiii. Labbe, Concilia, xii. p. 100.—Licet in primitivâ Ecclesiâ hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utrâque specie, postea a *conficientibus* (i.e. by the *consecrating* Priest or *celebrant*) sub utrâque et a laicis tantum sub specie panis —hujusmodi *consuetudo* habenda est pro *lege*. The Council of Trent, Sess. xxi. c. 1, declares—Nullo divino præcepto Laicos et Clericos *non conficientes* obligari ad Eucharistiæ Sacramentum sub utrâque specie sumendum; and the Trent Catechism says, De Euch. 69, Sanctæ Ecclesiæ lege interdictum ne quis sine ipsius Ecclesiæ auctoritate præter Sacerdotes corpus Domini in sacrificio *conficientes* sub utrâque specie sacram Eucharistiam sumat.

the laity in both kinds in the primitive Church, yet that to avoid certain inconveniences and scandals*, a *laudable custom* had been introduced, that the laity should receive only in one kind, and that the celebrant alone should receive both; and that this *practice* is to be held as a law, and any priest who henceforth administers to the people in both kinds, is to be excommunicated, and punished as guilty of heresy, and delivered over, if necessary, to the secular arm," —*i. e.* to be burnt†.

Thus the Church of Rome at Constance pretended a reverence for the Eucharist, and (as if Christ had no reverence for it) disobeyed and dishonoured Him Who instituted it: like the Priests and Pharisees of old, who would not "go into Pilate's hall lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover‡," but killed Him who was the true Passover; so she pleaded a pious dread, lest a drop of the

* The pretexts, which will not bear translating into English, were such as the following. See Von der Hardt, Concil. Const. iii. p. 369, seqq. "Ne sanguis Christi effunderetur; Ne laici incurrerent pœnas madidando barbam aut vestem; Quia portare Christi sanguinem ad infirmos longè ab Ecclesiis distantes equitando esset periculosum propter lapsum tam hominis quam jumenti. Quia plures sunt qui non possunt vinum bibere nec odorare. Si etiam servaretur sanguis, de facili mutaretur in *acetum*." The last reason must have been found hard to reconcile with the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

† This was the consequence of being "delivered over as guilty of heresy to the secular arm;"—as was seen at this same Council in the cases of John Huss and Jerome of Prague.

‡ John xviii. 28.

sacred wine should be spilt, and yet in maintaining the decree of Constance, has not scrupled to shed rivers of human blood, and to pierce and tear the mystical Body of Christ. Thus also she has not only made the Word of God of none effect by her tradition, but she punishes *obedience* to it as *mortal sin!* Her plea is, that what she punishes is disobedience to the Church, disobedience prompted by the Arch-enemy of the Church!

This brings me to the next passage of my Letters, which is selected for animadversion by the Dublin Reviewer.

He thus speaks:—

We produce now a very extraordinary passage from p. 150:—

"Nay more, not only does she thus render the Word of God of none effect, but she even ascribes His oracles to the dictation of the Evil One. Cardinal Hosius says, 'That which the Church (of Rome) teaches, is the express word of God, and that which is held contrary to the sense and consent of the Church, is the express word of the Devil.' So that if we believe that Christ commands us to receive in both kinds, saying, 'Drink ye all of this,' and, 'Except ye drink my blood, ye have no life in you,' as the Church of Rome herself once taught and practised, we should obey Satan and not God."

This passage represents Dr. Wordsworth's understanding of Hosius; and he has quoted in his notes the passages he alludes to. The Cardinal, in his tract *de expresso Dei Verbo*, observes upon the practice of heretics always quoting Scripture, but in a sense altogether their own.

The Devil, he says, quoted Scripture to our Lord, but in a sense that was impious and profane: so the heretics are ever ready with phrases of Scripture, but used by them in a bad sense, as the Devil did when he tempted our Lord. As the Devil then cited the very words of Scripture, so do his members now by means of Scriptural sayings labour to persuade Christians to throw themselves away from the protection of the Church. "What the Church teaches," he says, "is the word of God;" what is contrary to her teaching, even if it be in the very words of Scripture, is the teaching of Satan himself. He further shows, that the practice of communion in both kinds was clamoured for, not because it was the command of Christ, but through contempt of the Church, and in defiance of her authority. "The Church commanded to receive in one kind; Satan in both." This is the substance of the words of Hosius, and Dr. Wordsworth has used them as if the Cardinal held that communion in both kinds is the work of Satan. It is this perversion that we complain of. So far is the Cardinal from disliking absolutely such communion, that he has said in this very tract that it might be permitted; and it is because men clamoured for the cup in a wicked and rebellious spirit, that he says Satan desired it. Dr. Wordsworth might have known this: we really are almost compelled to believe that he has deliberately misunderstood the place he quotes, which is this: "It is the rule or custom of Christ's body, the Church, that we communicate under one kind; his [Satan's] under both. It is the rule or custom of Christ's body, the Church, that we communicate under both kinds; his, either under one or neither." Who but Dr. Wordsworth could have failed to see that the Cardinal is putting two conditions before us, with neither of which Satan would have been satisfied? The object of heretics being, not

communion in both kinds, but the destruction of the Church; for how can we ever believe that they were sincere in desiring the cup, when they were destroying the priesthood, by which alone the Sacrament could be had?

If, my dear Sir, Scripture is not the Word of God, and if the Pope is what he claims to be, a Deity upon earth, and if much of the doctrine and practice of Rome is not contrary to Scripture, then and then only have I misrepresented Hosius. He says, "that what the Church teaches"—that is, according to him, as we have seen, what the Church of *Rome* teaches,—"is the express Word of God:" that is,—for example, the *denial* of the cup to the laity,—although Christ said, "Drink ye all of this," and although this command was obeyed by the Church in and from the times of the Apostles for a thousand years,—is agreeable to the Word of God! And, adds the Cardinal, that "which is held contrary to the sense and consent of the Church (of Rome), is the express word of the *Devil;*" so that when, in opposition to the novel teaching and practice of the existing Church of Rome, *we* proclaim Christ's command, "Drink ye all of this," we do not utter the language of Christ, but of the Evil One.

What, Sir, I ask, is this but to attribute, as I have said, the oracles of God to the dictation of the Enemy of man?

But, according to the Reviewer, what does Hosius mean, when he says, that "whatever is held contrary

to the sense and consent of the Church, is the express word of the Devil?' The reply is: "Hosius did not hold communion in both kinds to be the work of Satan," but "men clamoured for the cup in a wicked and rebellious spirit," and therefore Hosius says "*Satan* desired it." Good' heavens! "Hosius did not hold communion in both kinds to be the work of Satan;" a Romish Cardinal did *not* hold, that what CHRIST commanded is the work of Satan! What a defence! But we turn our eyes from it, and pass on.

Let me next observe, that the latter proposition of Hosius ("whatever is held contrary to the Church, is the word of the Devil") is a general one, totally irrespective of the *motive* by which any one may be *suspected* of being actuated in opposing the "sense and consent of the Church" of Rome. *Any* resistance to her, on *any ground*, is, he affirms, the work of the Evil One. The language of *Scripture, if quoted against her*, is the voice of the Enemy of man. If then it can be reconciled with the Divine will, that Scripture—Scripture as interpreted by Reason and the practice of the primitive Church, yes, and by that of the ancient Church of *Rome* herself,—should be abrogated by the *Pope*, and set aside by the corrupt usage of the *existing* Church of Rome, then have I misrepresented Hosius; but not otherwise.

Secondly, the Reviewer speaks of "men *clamouring* for *the cup* in a wicked and rebellious spirit." What! my dear Sir, they who reverenced the last injunction

of their Divine Lord, were guilty of wickedness and rebellion! Their just demands were a "clamour!" They who laboured to recover the *birthright* of the *Church*, were animated by "*contempt* of the *Church*," and were acting in "defiance of her authority!" He pretends to read the hearts of past generations, and to tell us in what spirit "the cup was *clamoured for*;" but he never seems to have reflected in what spirit was the cup *withdrawn?* in what spirit is the cup *withheld?* in what spirit are they who would administer it sentenced to *excommunication?* in what spirit were they, who would restore the cup, condemned to be *burnt?* and what spirit is it which would *defend* these crimes? May there not, perhaps, be something of the spirit of Satan in all these acts? Let him ponder these questions. Good things, I grant, are not always demanded in a good spirit; but the *nature* of the thing is not thereby altered: but *crimes* cannot be committed or excused by any one, in any other than a bad spirit. Instead therefore of apologizing for the sins of Rome in this matter, let them who wish her well endeavour to bring her to repentance and amendment. Let them conjure her to *restore* the cup—by withdrawing and withholding which, she has excommunicated herself. Let her endeavour and pray to be delivered from the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity, in which she now is, and to recover the liberty which Christ has given to His Church.

I turn for a short time from the Reviewer to a con-

sideration of the *ground* on which the Church of Rome sought to justify the withdrawal and the withholding of the cup in the Eucharist from all but the Priest who administers it.

This inquiry will bring out still more clearly the *destructive* principles on which the Church of Rome has acted with respect to the Word of God.

The Council of Constance, in which she made it heresy for a priest to administer the cup to the laity, was held, as I have said, in the year 1415. Among the Divines of the Church of Rome, who were eminent in that century, none enjoyed a higher reputation than Cardinal *Cusanus** or *Nicolas de Cusa*, born near Trêves on the Moselle, in the year 1401: he was dean of St. Florinus at Coblentz, Archdeacon of Liege, and engaged in the Council of Basle in 1431, raised to the see of Brixen, and created a Cardinal by Pope Nicolas V., in 1448; and employed by him on confidential embassies in Germany, made Governor of Rome during the Pope's absence, and charged by the Pope with an especial mission to the estates of Bohemia †, who demanded the restoration of the cup in the Eucharist.

* "Theologorum suo tempore facile princeps."—Trittenheim in Vitâ ed. Basil. 1565 præfixâ.

† Cusani Epist. iv. ad Bohemos, p. 846.—Voluit divina pietas, ut ordinatione sanctissimi et piissimi Pontificis nostri Nicolai Papæ Quinti, summè pro vestrâ ac omnium salute vigilantes, ut vestræ ad Apostolicæ sedis unitatem redintegrationis post multos longè nobis aptiores legatos, ad nos nunc perveniret qualiscunque solicitudo. He

His letters addressed to them, with a view of recovering them to the see of Rome, are still extant; and, having been written by him in his official legatine character, as he himself declares, they may be regarded as expounding the doctrine of the Church of Rome on this important subject at that critical period, when the decree of Constance had been just framed and promulgated to the world.

I make no apology for the length of the following quotations, on account of their importance, derived from the character of the person from whom they come, and the time at which they were written; and because they display very clearly the spirit in which the Church of Rome acts towards the Scriptures and the Sacraments.

They also possess an interest, of a melancholy character, as showing that the *Doctrine* of *Development*, which has been supposed by some to be a new one, (but which has been shown in my Letters to you to be an inevitable consequence of Romish principles, as will, I think, be allowed by all who will trace those principles to their results,) was propounded in

informs them, that what he does is by instruction from *the Pope*. Ibid. Epist. vi. p. 851.—Nequaquàm putetis nos ad ea quæ prius scripsimus, ob quæ à vobis de imprudentiâ arguimur, sine Pontificis nostri jussu processisse. Si enim simpliciter, modò quo alii Christiani, obedire recusatis, ad placitandum vobis nemo ab Apostolicâ sede mitteretur. Non est enim consuetudinis, nec juris, quòd Christi Vicarius et Judex fidei se subjiciat, et placitationem cum suis subditis ineat. This letter is dated Brixiæ, 1452.

all its plenitude by a Cardinal Legate of Rome, in the middle of the fifteenth century.

He lays it down as a first principle *, that "for an infallible Rule of salvation, Christ has given this power to the Church, that when we continue in communion with her, adhering to the chair of Peter (that is, to the Papacy), we cannot err, although one person in the Church may walk in one way, and another in another."

"That Church," says he, "is the Pillar of Truth which adheres to the Chair of Peter and the Roman See." The Church, therefore, of which Cusanus speaks throughout, is the Church of *Rome;* the Church which is in communion with what he calls the Chair of Peter; the Church which regards the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, and an Infallible Judge in all matters of faith. It is this Church, and *no other.*

He then explains the Roman doctrine concerning Scripture. "It is not possible," he says, "that Scripture, whatever precept it may contain, can have more power of laying any obligation on the members of the Church, *than the Church herself allows,* or than she embodies either in her teaching or in her practice."

He enforces this principle in the following words:—

"If the Church dictates any command, to be re-

* The passages quoted from Cardinal Cusanus in this letter, will be found in their original language, in the Appendix G.

ceived as a Divine precept contained in Scripture, its validity is to be reverently acknowledged as promulgated through the medium of the Church."

"If, again, the Church receives and interprets Scripture in her practice, and by her common use, in a *different* manner from that in which it has been understood by *former* generations, the Scripture, so understood as she understands it, must be regarded as authoritative."

"If the Church, in a Council," (he is referring to that of Constance,) "shall have decided whether Scripture (although unfolded in a positive precept) is to be received according to its letter, or according to her own sense, then since Scripture has no authority any further than as dictated by the Church, it cannot lay us under any obligation to obey the letter; but we must follow the *experimental sense* of the *Church;* since it is the Church which has no taint or wrinkle, either of error or deception."

Cusanus was aware that the Divine Precept of Scripture, "Drink ye all of this," had been interpreted by the *practice* of the Church, yes, and of the Church of *Rome*, in and from the time of the Apostles, for a thousand years, as conveying an injunction for the administration of the Eucharist in *both kinds;* how then could the Church of Rome be justified in making such administration to be *heretical?* and in condemning those who practised it to be excommunicated and burnt? How, again,

could that Interpreter be infallible which interpreted Scripture to mean one thing at one time, and the very *opposite* thing at *another?*

If the *practice* of the Church is the infallible interpreter of Scripture, the meaning of Scripture as explained by the Church for ten centuries must be, that the Communion is to be given in both kinds; how then could it be made to mean that the cup may be denied to the laity? and how then could Scripture be said to have any meaning at all?

These were hard questions: let us hear the Cardinal's reply.

"You will ask," he says, "perhaps, how shall the precepts of Christ be changed by the authority of the Church, so as to be obligatory upon you, when the Church thinks fit? I answer: *There* are *no precepts of Christ*, except those which are received by the Church as such. Therefore, if the Church enjoins them as Christ's precepts, *then* we must obey them as His.

"If, therefore, there is any difference in the understanding or exposition of these precepts, in place or time, *that* exposition is to be regarded as recommended to *us*, which the greater or saner part of the Church approves either in word or deed, notwithstanding that a different practice was formerly in vogue."

"And this," he adds, "is *not a change*, as if it

were effected by an authority *inferior* to that of Christ; for the Church (of Rome), which is His Body, and is animated by His Spirit, does nothing else but what Christ Himself wills. Hence, therefore, this change of intepretation proceeds from Christ Himself in the same way as the original precept did, which was formerly put in use in a different manner, according to the conveniency of other times: and therefore the Church has the same power of laying obligations upon us, and removing them again, as is possessed by Christ Himself."

Such, Sir, was the teaching of this Cardinal, who was entrusted by the Pope with a special commission for silencing the demands of the Bohemians for Communion in both kinds, and for recovering them to the See of Rome; and who wrote what he did by special instructions from the Papal See.

I will add but one more passage, in which he endeavours to reply to the objections which I have specified above.

"You will say perhaps, that the Church does not now follow the same practice in the administration of the Communion as heretofore, when men of the greatest sanctity affirmed, both in word and deed, that Communion in *both* kinds is *necessary*, by virtue of Christ's command. Could the Church err at *that time?* you will ask. I reply, 'Certainly not.' 'But if not,' you answer, 'how can that be *not* true

to-day, which *formerly* was affirmed universally to be true? How, you say, can this be, when the present Church is not different from the former one?"

"Be not at all disturbed," replies the Cardinal, "by this circumstance, that at different times different rites in sacrifices, and even in sacraments, are found to prevail, the truth being unchanged; be not troubled at this, that the *Scriptures* are *accommodated to the times*, and are differently understood at different seasons, so that in one age they are expounded in one way, according to the universal practice then current, and when that *practice* is *changed*, their *sense* is *changed also*.

"For Christ" (he adds), "to whom the Father has given the rule over heaven and earth, being enthroned as Monarch over both, dispenses His mysteries in a wonderful order of Angels and Men, according to the variations of the times, and dictates what is suitable for every season, either by secret inspiration or by manifest illumination.

"Therefore, although the Interpretation which the Church *now* gives to the precept of the Gospel is different from that which she gave *formerly*, yet this signification which is now current in the Church, being divinely dictated to her, as suited to the times, for her government, ought to be accepted by you as the way of Salvation."

Again: "It is clear that the entire Catholic Church cannot be bound by the letter of Scripture, although

it is always bound by the spirit: for when the letter does not tend to spiritual edification, then it receives that which rather serves for the spirit..... The letter, therefore, of Scripture, is not essential to the Church, but it is the spirit which gives life. Therefore it is not surprising, that the *practice* of the Church *at one time interprets* Scripture in one way, and at another time in another way; for the interpretation moves in a parallel line with the practice, and the practice which so moves is the spirit that gives life."

"Lastly: This is the true doctrine concerning the texts of Scripture, and also concerning that, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*.' As the Church receives Scripture, so she interprets it. The Scriptures *follow* the Church, which is prior to Scripture, and for which Scripture exists, and not conversely; and they who have not considered this, have vainly impugned the Church, and separated themselves from it. But the administration of the Sacraments is confided to their Ministers, by illumination; that is, the Sacraments are to be administered by them in such a manner as they think most expedient, for the good of souls, and the glory of God, according to time and place."

Such, Sir, are the principles on which the greatest

* John vi. 53.

questions which can occupy our thoughts, and which affect the dearest interests of men both for Time and Eternity, have been decided by the Church of Rome, and thus were they argued by her chosen advocates, when she endeavoured by their means to recover nations to her Communion in the age of the Council of Constance, at which she took that fatal step, which she has never yet retraced, of denouncing the administration of the Eucharist in the manner prescribed by Him who instituted it, and in which it was administered by Him,—as Heresy, to be punished by fire.

You see, then, in what manner that act was brought about; and by what pleas it was defended by a Roman Bishop and Cardinal, the Envoy of the Papal See. Reason is to be sacrificed; the practice of Christ, and of His Apostles, and of His Church, for a thousand years, is to be set at nought; and Scripture is to melt away into a liquid wave, whose only business it is to be, to reflect the features of the Roman Polyphieme*.

Therefore let me ask, Will not you, my dear Sir, and other reflecting persons in the Church of Rome, who know something of history, and who possess intellectual ability, will not you arouse yourselves and inquire, whether it is not an abject degradation of

* Who says—
"Non sum adeo informis; nuper me in litore vidi
Quum placidum ventis staret mare."—VIRGIL, Ecl. ii. 25.

humanity—but this is as nothing—whether it is not a profane outrage on the dignity of the *Divine Author* of human nature, and the Lawgiver and Judge of the World, that now, in this nineteenth century, reasonable and immortal beings should be bound in fetters forged by such hands as those who set their names to the decrees of Constance, and as defended them by such arguments as those of Cardinal Cusanus? Have you no sense of the wrongs thus inflicted on the human race? no virtuous abhorrence of this slave-trade of the soul * ? no zeal for the honour of Scripture? none for the memory of Apostles, Saints, and Martyrs, whom the Fathers of Constance committed, in will though not in deed, as heretics to the flames, in the persons of John Huss † and Jerome of Prague? Above all, have you no reverence for the Majesty of Him Who called Himself not Custom, but the Truth; Who instituted the Sacramental Supper to be "meat indeed, and drink indeed," to the soul; Who affirmed, that "Except ye eat My flesh, and drink My blood, ye have no life

* Rev. xviii. 13.

† On the 21st of June, 1415, (*i. e.* a fortnight before his death,) "Hussus per literas Bohemas monuit ne Jacobellum calicis sacri restituti autorem impugnarent." Von der Hardt, iv. p. 31. Jerome of Prague "eodem in busto quo nuper Hussus concrematus est." May 30, 1416. The restoration of the cup, though not an article of the teaching of Huss and Jerome of Prague, was the direct consequence of their appeal to Scripture and primitive antiquity; and was effected mainly by Jacobus de Misa, or Jacobellus, who persuaded the University of Prague to advocate his doctrine in a public confession.

in you* ;" and Who has declared by His holy Apostle, that what the true Church of Christ did in the age of the Apostles, that also will it be doing when the Lord comes,—eating the Sacramental bread, and drinking the Sacramental cup† ?

If you have no sense of these things, you will persist in calling yourselves Catholics, and us Heretics ; you will persevere in praying that we may become like you ; you will embrace the chains which enthral you, and boast you are free ; you will call the stupor of the soul serenity, and its sleep bliss : *but* if you examine this matter by the light of Reason, Scripture, and the Church, you will make a great and glorious effort to break the chains of Constance and of Trent ; you will do what it is your bounden duty to do, for recovering your moral and intellectual liberty, and for regaining your Christian privileges, and for vindicating the Divine honour, and for advancing the cause of truth, and for putting an end to schism, and for restoring the unity of the Church.

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours truly, &c. &c.

* John vi. 53. 55. † 1 Cor. xi. 26.

LETTER VI.

Glossæ Viperina est quæ corrodit Viscera Textûs.—II. COKE, 34.

Occlamant illi, "Attendite ad Vias, videte et interrogate ex priscis semitis quæ via bona sit, et ambulate in eâ;" et ipsi piorum hominum scripta ex animi sui sententiâ interpolant: voces, membra, sententias addunt, detrahunt. Patres fingunt et refingunt arbitratu suo. —FRANCIS JUNIUS, Præfat. ad Indicem expurgatorium.

MY DEAR SIR,

In my Letters to you (p. 147, 2nd edit.) I wrote as follows:—

"It was *once* the real meaning of Scripture, that all communicants should receive *both kinds*, for it was once the *practice* of the Church of Rome to administer both kinds, and Pope Gelasius condemned the practice of *half-communion* as sacrilegious*; but the Church of Rome *now* administers but one kind, and therefore the meaning of God's Word has changed;—yes, what it once *commanded*, it now *forbids*. Nor is it content with *forbidding;* but any presbyter who

* "Grande sacrilegium," A.D. 492. Jus Canon. Comperimus, de Consecratione, dist. 2. c. 12.

communicates the people in *both kinds* may be delivered over to the Secular arm as a *heretic* * : and we must follow the *practice* of the Church of Rome, and believe it to be the true exponent of Scripture †."

On this passage the Dublin Reviewer thus comments:—

In pp. 147, 148, we have this: "Pope Gelasius condemned the practice of *half-communion* as sacrilegious." For this assertion he quotes *Gratian, de cons.* ii. 12. *Comperimus.* We find it impossible to explain upon what principle Dr. Wordsworth reads books. The title of the Canon he quotes, and the gloss upon it, forbid us to read it as he has done. The Canon forbids the priest to abstain from receiving the cup, and that abstinence it calls a "great sacrilege." It is the celebrant the Canon condemns, not the lay-communicant; and the rule of the

* "The language of the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414—1418, is most explicit on this matter, and exhibits a most striking practical specimen of Development in all its anti-scriptural destructiveness. The following are its words (Sess. XIII. Labbe, vol. xii. p. 100):—'In nomine Sanctæ et Individuæ Trinitatis . . Amen. Hoc præsens Concilium Sacrum generale Constantiense in Spiritu Sancto legitimè congregatum, decernit; quòd *licet Christus* discipulis administraverit sub *utrâque specie*, . . tamen *hoc non obstante, consuetudo* est rationabiliter introducta, quòd, *licet* in primitivâ Ecclesiâ reciperetur sub *utrâque* specie, *posteà a laicis* tantummodo sub specie panis recipiatur' —therefore any presbyter who administers in both kinds is 'ut *hæreticus* coercendus, invocato etiam ad hoc, si opus fuerit, *brachio seculari*.'"

† "'For some *wise purpose*, doubtless,' (says Mr. Newman, p. 366,) 'such as that of showing the power of the Church in the dispensation of Divine grace, as well as the perfection and spirituality of the Eucharistic presence, the cup is withheld from all but the celebrant in the Holy Eucharist.'"

Church is no more condemned by it than it is by the statute of mortmain or the reform-bill.

To this I reply, by *reiterating my assertion;* which I prove thus.

Gelasius was Bishop of Rome at the end of the fifth century, (A. D. 492—496). The passage which I quote from him is taken from one of his Letters * to two brother *Bishops.* In it he thus speaks:—

"We † hear that *certain persons*" (he does not call them *Priests*) "receive a portion of the sacred body alone, and abstain from the cup of the sacred blood. Let such persons by all means (since they are said to be bound by the ties of some superstition) either receive, or be repelled from, the entire sacrament; because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without *great sacrilege.*"

On the strength of this passage it was, and is, affirmed by me, that Pope Gelasius (that is, a so-called Infallible Judge of the Church of Rome) condemned half-communion as *grande sacrilegium;* and that therefore Rome stands self-convicted of impiety.

But the Reviewer ventures to affirm, that the prohibition of Gelasius refers to the consecrating *Priest* alone, and not to any one else; and thus, while he pretends to revere a Pope as infallible, he flatly con-

* See Jus Canon. i. pp. 882. 1151, ed. 1839.—De hoc capite notatum est esse partem epistolæ . . .

† The original words will be found in the Appendix H.

tradicts him! For look, Sir, at the words of Gelasius. "I hear that *some persons abstain* from the cup." But these, says the Reviewer, were Priests, and Priests alone. What, Sir, Priests of Rome bound by the ties of a certain superstition! This is very strange: besides, these Priests put themselves forward, and are allowed by other Priests to consecrate the holy elements! and this they do, when, if they did not take upon themselves to be *celebrants*, they might escape unnoticed, for it is the *celebrant* alone, according to the Reviewer, that the Pope forbids to abstain from the cup; and this they also do, when, if they, being celebrants, abstain from the wine, the wine consecrated by them, which, according to the Reviewer, was only to be tasted by the celebrant, will never be tasted at all! Why then did they consecrate it *? But this is not all the absurdity which the critic palms upon the Pope. These superstitious celebrants are either to receive the whole Sacrament, or to be *repelled* from the whole, because, says the Pope, the division of the Sacrament cannot take place without great sacrilege; so that Priests, (not laymen,) superstitious Priests, are either to be admitted, not only to communicate, but to consecrate the elements, *or* else they are to be repelled from the Communion; and repelled by whom? by the celebrant,—that is, by themselves!

* See Jacobellum c. Brodam ap. Von der Hardt, Concil. Const. iii. 476, and ibid. 637.

But the Reviewer says—

We find it impossible to explain upon what principle Dr. Wordsworth reads books. The *Title* of the Canon he quotes, and the *Gloss* upon it, forbids us to read it as he has done. The Canon forbids the *Priest* to abstain from receiving the cup, and *that* abstinence it calls a great sacrilege. It is the *celebrant* the Canon condemns, and not the lay communicant.

"The *Title* and the *Gloss*," affirms the Reviewer, make the prohibition apply to the *Priest* alone. The Title and the Gloss! Yes, Sir, and here is *another* striking instance of the "Destructive character of the Church of Rome." She spares no one, not even her own Popes. I have now a few words to say about the "*Title* and the *Gloss* *."

The precept of Gelasius, as I have observed, is found in one of his Letters, with *no* "Title or Gloss." It is simply a paragraph in an Epistle. This paragraph was extracted from the Letter, and transcribed into the Canon Law of the Roman Church, and it stands in the Collection of Canons called the Decretum of Gratian †, who was a Benedictine Monk of Bologna in the twelfth century, and completed his work

* The Title is, Corpus Christi sine ejus sanguine *sacerdos* non debet accipere. The Gloss is in the edition of Gratian, A. D. 1518, p. 545, Hoc intelligo de *conficiente*: nam infirmus, vel sanus in necessitate, sine vino corpus sumere potest. In later editions, this is "hoc *debet* intelligi," &c.

† Celebrated for this work by Dante, Paradiso, x. 104—

"Grazian—che l'uno e l'altro foro
Aiutò si, che piace in Paradiso."

about the year 1149, and dedicated it to Pope Eugenius III. You will find the same paragraph of Gelasius in the earlier collection of Canons made by Ivo *, Bishop of Chartres, who is called a most careful interpreter † of the Constitutions of the Church. But *there* it stands with *this title:* "The Body of the Lord is not to be received without the Cup ‡;" and another collector of Canons in the same age, Micrologus §, declares that Gelasius had commanded "all to be excommunicated, whosoever (*quicunque*) having received the Body abstained from the Blood;" and Radulphus de Rivo, who transcribes the words of Micrologus, gives the same reason as he does, viz. the very words of Gelasius, that "the sacraments cannot be divided without great sacrilege;" and Cassander ‖ informs us, that in his Old Manuscript of Canons, this was the title of the Decree: "*No one* is permitted to receive the Communion of the Body alone without partaking of the Blood."

What then has the Reviewer's remark led to? To the revelation of the fact, that the Church of Rome, finding that one of her own *ancient* Popes condemns

* Ayliffe, Parergon, p. xvii.

† "Canonum Sanctorum Patrum ac generalium cautissimus interpres: scripsit ex canonibus sanctorum compendiosum decretum."—Trithemius, de Script. Eccles. 349.

‡ Ivo, Decret. part ii. c. 89, p. 66, ed. Lovan. 1561. "Non esse sumendum Corpus Domini sine calice." *Gelasius* Majorico et Joanni Episcopis.

§ De Eccles. Observ. cap. 19. Bibl. Max. Patrum.

‖ De Commun. in utrâque specie, p. 1106.

her *present* practice of half-communion as a *great Sacrilege*, has treated him with the same arrogance as she has done Scripture; she has taken the words of Gelasius, and has dealt with them as she has dealt with many other authorities of a similar kind*; she has clapped a viperine gloss by their side to eat out the bowels of his text, and has posted a title at their head to belie the whole body; or, if I may so say, she has put her own Infallible Judge into the pillory for speaking the truth; and has ordered him to recant his own orthodoxy, and to adopt her corruptions; and has made that to apply to the *Priest* alone, which Gelasius intended for *all*.

This is so evident, that it is allowed (as the Reviewer ought to have known) even by your greatest Roman Catholic Church Historian, Cardinal Baronius, a Pope's Confessor, and protonotary of the Church. He says† that *some* persons interpret the "words of Gelasius, of the *Priest alone*. But," he adds, "In truth, there is in those words no mention made of the *celebrant;* and that which is evidently spoken generally, ought *by no means* to be *restricted* to the *Priest*. We reject, therefore‡," he says, "this

* For numerous instances of corruptions in the *Canon Law*, by means of titles and glosses, and even mutilations of the text, see Dr. James's "Corruption of the true Fathers," pp. 190. 245, 246. 252. 258. 262. 264, 265, ed. London, 1688.

† Baronii Annales Eccles. ad A. D. 496, tom. v. p. 571, ed. Colon. 1609.

‡ The Cardinal's words are: "Reverà nulla ibi de sacerdote

childish interpretation." Such is your great Historian's opinion of the solution of the Reviewer, who will, I suppose, say, that he "finds it impossible to understand upon what principle" Cardinal Baronius "read books:" I, for my own part, am puzzled to understand on what principle the Reviewer does *not* read them.

But I turn from him to the Cardinal. Many of my readers will be aware, that Baronius, finding the fraud of the "gloss and the title" to be too glaring, and yet not willing to admit the fatal alternative that half-communion had been condemned by a Pope as a "great sacrilege," devised an ingenious method for getting rid of this difficulty; he alleged, that Pope Gelasius *enjoined* communion in both kinds, in order to detect *Manichæans*.

We know from Pope Leo I., who was Bishop of Rome * more than a quarter of a century before Gelasius, that the Manichæans (who were the predecessors of the present Parsees or sun worshippers) believed in two Principles, one good and the other evil, and held other monstrous opinions; that they abominated wine, which they called the gall of the Devil, and yet sometimes surreptitiously stole into Christian congregations, and intruded even into the ranks of Communicants, and that they received

sacrificante mentio habetur; ut planè, quod generaliter esse dictum apparet, ad sacerdotes minime restringi debere satis intelligi possit. Rejicimus igitur frigidam ejusmodi .... solutionem."

* Leo, A. D. 440—461; Gelasius, A. D. 492—496.

the bread, and also the wine, but would never swallow the latter, but *pretended* to swallow it, and afterwards ejected it from their mouths *.

Leo mentions in one of his sermons † this fact of their "declining to swallow the wine;" and he tells his hearers, that he informs them of it in order that these Manichæan intruders may be made manifest to them by this test, and that they who are convicted of thus sacrilegiously counterfeiting the character of Communicants, may be excommunicated by the Priests.

It is alleged by Cardinal Baronius ‡, that Leo I., and Gelasius after him, *enacted* that the cup should be administered to the Laity, to detect these Manichæans. Hence, says he, the decree of Gelasius.

To what wretched shifts, my dear Sir, are your greatest men driven by their desire and determination to maintain the corruptions of Rome at all hazards. Desperate, indeed, must the cause be, which

* See the passages quoted by Bp. Andrewes, ad Card. Bellarmin. cap. 8. p. 190. Manichæis—non *haurire*, simulare tamen quasi hauriant; pitissare scilicet, pauxillum ore continere nec haurire, expuere post, sed interim quasi hausissent simulare.

† See the original words in Appendix I.

‡ Baron. Annal. ad A.D. 496. Quod igitur abstinentiâ calicis proderentur penitus Manichæi, idem planè remedium quo usus est Sanctus Leo adhibendum putavit esse Gelasius, ut latitantes sub Catholico nomine impios detegeret Manichæos; — Prudentissimè quidem S. Leonis insistens Gelasius istud quod *vidimus* sancivit decretum. And this opinion is adopted by celebrated Romish divines of this day; *e. g.* Perrone, pars I. c. iii. p. 233, "ad Manichæos detegendos."

can be defended by persons of their ability with no better arguments than these. Observe what absurdities are fathered on Leo and Gelasius by the Cardinal's hypothesis.

First, Leo detects the Manichæans by their abstinence from the cup; and yet he is said to have *enjoined* its administration, *in order* to detect them!

Secondly, Leo does not order the Priest to administer the cup, but he speaks to the People concerning the refusal of the Manichæans to partake of it; he *supposes* the cup to be administered, as a *matter of course,* and that every one will partake of it; and yet he is said to *enjoin* the Priests to administer, what he clearly implies it has been always the practice of the people to receive!

Thirdly, Gelasius, who was a quarter of a century after Leo, is made to say that he *does not know* what is the tie of superstition by which these supposed Manichees are bound, as if the reason for which the Manichees refused wine had not been given by Leo *, and was not notorious to all; viz. that wine was created by the Devil.

Fourthly, He is made to call Manichæism a *superstition;* that is, an excess of reverence; whereas, it was rank *infidelity;* and so Leo calls it †.

* Leo Serm. xli. Damnant creaturarum naturam in Creatoris injuriam, et contaminari edentes asserunt iis quorum non Deum sed *Diabolum* conditorem esse definiunt.

† Leo, l. c. ad tegendam *infidelitatem* suam nostris audent interesse mysteriis.

Fifthly, He is made to say that these intruders are either to be repelled from the entire Sacrament, *or* to be *admitted to it* *. Manichæan *infidels* admitted, by a Pope's order, to the Holy Communion!

And, *sixthly,* both these *Popes* are made to *enact* what had been enjoined by *Christ* Himself, and continued in the uninterrupted practice of the Church, from the times of the Apostles to their own!

Of this I beg to offer the following proofs:—

Justin Martyr, who lived in the middle of the second century, says, "that the Minister of the Church gives to *all present* the consecrated bread and wine †."

S. Cyprian ‡, in the third century, says, "that the cup of the Lord so refreshes the soul, that *every one* (unusquisque) grows sober from the love of the world, and recovers his relish for the things of God."

S. Cyril §, Bishop of Jerusalem, affirms, that the "doctrine of St. Paul affords us full satisfaction concerning the Holy Mysteries, by partaking of which we become of the same body and blood with Christ; .... for in the figure of Bread His Body, and in the figure of Wine His Blood, is given unto thee, that

* Aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur.

† Apol. i. 65. *διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου.*

‡ Epist. lxiii. p. 153, ed. Fell.

§ Cateches. xxii. Myst. iv. p. 320, ed. Bened. *ἵνα γένῃ μεταλαβὼν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτῷ.*

being a partaker of Christ's Body and Blood, thou mayest be of one Body and Blood with Him."

S. Basil*, in the fourth century, affirms, "That the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ is necessary to Salvation."

S. Ambrose†, in the same century, says, "Eat, my brethren, and refresh yourselves; for as oft as ye drink ye receive remission of sins, and are refreshed by the Spirit."

S. Chrysostom‡ asserts, that "one table is spread for all, and one cup given to all."

S. Augustine§ says, that all "who desire life, are exhorted to drink of this cup."

This brings us to the age of Leo and Gelasius; and the evidence of the practice of the ancient Church is so clear, that even the Church of Rome at the Council of Constance, in the fifteenth century, was compelled to confess, in the very decree in which she made it heretical to administer in both kinds, that "Christ instituted the Eucharist in both kinds; and that in the primitive Church it was received in both kinds by the faithful‖."

* Reg. Moral. 21. ἀναγκαία πρὸς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

† De Sacram. v. 3.

‡ Homil. xxxii. in Matth. vol. i. p. 455, ed. Field. μία τράπεζα πρόκειται πᾶσιν, τὸ αὐτὸ ποτὸν ἅπασι δέδοται, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ μόνον τὸ αὐτὸ ποτὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς ποτηρίου πίνειν. So again, 2 Cor. Hom. 14. πᾶσιν ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν ποτήριον.

§ Qu. lvii. in Levit.

‖ Sess. xiii. vol. xii. p. 100, ed. Labbe. Licet Christus post

And yet Cardinal Baronius tells us, that Communion in both kinds was devised by Leo and Gelasius—(the idea is almost too shocking to express)—as a snare to catch Manichæans!

The Reviewer, as we have seen, is condemned by Cardinal Baronius; and the Cardinal, as we shall see, is refuted in his turn, by another member of the College of Cardinals, Cardinal Bona.

Cardinal Bona was one of the most eminent Romish writers, particularly on Liturgical matters; and in his work on that subject, published in 1671, he says*:—

"'It is certain that *all*, clergy and laity, men and women, received the Communion anciently in both kinds, when they were present at its public administration . . . . At *all times* and in *all places* (*semper et ubique*), from the infancy of the Church to the twelfth century, the faithful communicated in the kind both of bread and wine; and at the beginning of that century, the cup began by little and little to be disused, most bishops prohibiting its administration to the people, for fear of irreverence and effusion†."

cœnam instituerit et suis discipulis administraverit sub utrâque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen hoc non obstante, &c. . . . licet in primitivâ Ecclesiâ hujus modi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utrâque specie, &c.

* Bona was born at Mondovi, in Piedmont, in 1609, created a Cardinal by Clement XI., died at Rome 1674. It was said of him, when it was expected by some that he would be elected to fill the vacancy of the Papal chair at Clement's death, "Papa Bona sarebbe un solecismo."

† Bona, Rerum Liturg. lib. ii. c. xviii. n. 1.

The Decretum of Gratian was compiled at that time (A. D. 1149); and now the Reviewer may form a shrewd conjecture concerning the "Title and the Gloss."

Let me make one observation here concerning this work, called, "Decretum Aureum Divi vel Domini Gratiani," *i. e.* the "Golden Decretum of Saint or Lord Gratian." I quote this title from an edition of the year 1518. In this Work, which is sanctioned by the Church of Rome, not only are there many titles and glosses, which corrupt the meaning of the Text compiled from various quarters, but the *Text* itself is often adulterated. Thus, to cite a remarkable instance in the portion of the Work which treats of Repentance*, a passage of St. Ambrose is quoted as follows:—"They have not the inheritance of Peter, who have not the *See* of Peter, which they pluck into pieces with impious distraction."

This sounds very strange, even on the score of sense, to say nothing of doctrine: we turn to the earlier editions of St. Ambrose himself, and find† that what he really does say, is, "They have not the inheritance of Peter, who have not the *faith* of Peter." In the Golden Decretum the word *fidem* has been corrupted into *sedem:* and this reading, which is contrary to the sense of St. Ambrose, as any one

* Decret. De Pœn. Dist. i. c. 52. p. 1017. ed. 1839.
† De Pœnit. l. c. 7. § 33.

will see who reads the context of the passage, has now been propagated, not only in the Canon Law, but in some Editions* of St. Ambrose himself. Many instances of similar corruption might be cited †.

Before I conclude this Letter, let me request you to observe, that the criticism of the Reviewer has served to bring out the following important points:—

First. The *Inconsistency* of Roman teaching concerning the great article of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Your Divines, having once abandoned the plain letter of Scripture and the practice of the Primitive Church, are reduced to resort to pitiable shifts, at variance with Reason, History, and themselves; and thus, by their very discrepancies, they ought to excite you, and all reflecting persons of the Romish communion, to consider carefully whether you ought to rest contented with your present convictions; and whether that system can be safe which is beset with so many contradictions; and whether you may not find Truth, which is ever consistent with itself, where He, Who is the Truth, assures you it is to be found; namely, in His own Word.

* For instance, that of Paris, 1836, vol. iv. p. 93, and of Paris, 1845, vol. iii. p. 476.

† See a like instance of a corruption of St. Augustine, mentioned in Letters to M. Gondon, p. 94, and note.

Secondly. The Church of Rome, by adopting the Decretum of Gratian into her Code, and by commanding that it be universally received*, has made herself an accomplice in the depravation of the words of Gelasius, one of her own Popes, and has thus shown that though she professes to believe in the Infallibility of her Popes, yet she will tamper with their works, she will wrest them from their plain sense in the same way as she mangles Scripture; and that instead of conforming herself to her own so-called infallible Rule, she makes this Rule bend to her own corrupt practice; and she thus proves that she does not believe in that Infallibility in which she requires others to believe, and on which her system rests; and she is therefore convicted by herself of *Scepticism*, and of leading others to *Infidelity*.

Thirdly. By the Decree of the Council of Constance, which excommunicates all who administer in both kinds, the Church of Rome has virtually condemned her Pope Gelasius as a heretic; and by the Decree† of Trent, which pronounces a curse on all who affirm that Communion in *both* kinds is necessary, she has anathematized her Infallible Judge.

Fourthly. The Council of Constance‡, which en-

* See Pope Gregory the XIIIth's Order prefixed to the Canon Law, ed. Lips. 1839.

† Sess. xxi. can. 1.

‡ Conc. Const. Sess. xiii. June 15, A. D. 1415. Firmissimè credendum et nullatenus dubitandum integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri.

forced half-communion, affirmed that the entire Body and Blood of Christ is contained as well in the bread as in the wine; yet it was afterwards asserted by the Council of Trent*, and it is also affirmed in Pius the Fourth's Creed, that in the Eucharist "a change is made of the *whole* substance of the *bread* into the substance of the *body* of Christ, and of the *whole* substance of the *wine* into the substance of His *blood*;" that is, *none* of the bread becomes blood, and *none* of the wine becomes body; and so the blood cannot be contained in the bread, as the Council of Constance affirmed, nor the body in the wine; and so one infallible Council is contradicted by another.

Fifthly. It is evident that Gelasius *does* call half-communion *grande sacrilegium.*

Sixthly. If he called abstinence from the wine a great sacrilege, he would certainly have called the present practice of Rome, in which she not only *compels* the laity to abstain from the cup, but ex-

* Conc. Trident. Sess. xiii. Oct. 13, 1551. Sancta hæc synodus declarat per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus. In the twenty-first Session held 16th July, 1562, it would seem that the Fathers of the Council of Trent perceived they had spoken inconsistently with the language of the so-called General Council of Constance; and, therefore, instead of rescinding the decree of 1551 (which would have been an abdication of Infallibility, and therefore was not to be thought of), they *also* enact that "even under one kind the whole and entire Christ and true sacrament is received."

communicates all priests who administer it, a *grandissimum sacrilegium.*

And, *lastly.* If Pope Gelasius erred, then Roman Infallibility is an error; and if he did not err, then Rome stands convicted of very great sacrilege by one whom she affirms to have been Infallible.

I am, Sir,

Yours truly,

&c. &c.

LETTER VII.

" Serranus, clarum nomen, tua, Regule, proles,
Qui longum semper famâ gliscente per ævum
Infidis servasse fidem memorabere Pœnis."

My Dear Sir,

Such is the noble eulogy which the Latin Poet pronounced on Regulus, who, he says, has gained immortal renown by having kept faith with the faithless. I am reminded of these words by the next remark of the Dublin Reviewer, which is as follows:—

Page 281, in a note, Dr. Wordsworth says, "One of the decrees of the Council of Constance is, that 'faith is not to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the Church.' (Sess. 19.)" To this we give a flat denial, and defy any one, except the Canon of Westminster, to explain that decree to mean anything but that faith *must* be kept with heretics and all others to whom it is given.

The council of Constance, as was before said, is one of the *General Councils* of the Church of Rome;

the decrees of Constance are hers*; and therefore, in the passage cited from my Letters by the Reviewer, a very grave charge is brought by me against the Church of Rome; she is accused of being a "truce-breaker †," and of teaching a doctrine from which many heathens would have recoiled with horror: and if I have stated what is not true, I am bound not only to retract the accusation, but to feel and express deep regret that it was made.

But, on the other hand, If what I have said is really the fact, then you, and all other Roman Catholics, will have another reason for not remaining idle and unconcerned in your present position, and for exerting your influence to reform your Church, in lieu of defending it; and instead of expecting a retractation from me, you ought to endeavour to obtain repentance and reparation from her.

The question is, Was it decreed by the Church of Rome in the Council of Constance that "faith is not to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the Church?"

In reply to this enquiry, let me remind you of the following facts:—

John Huss was a Priest, and Professor of Theology

* Perrone, ii. 983. "Concilium Constantiense a Rom. Pontificibus confirmatum est in gestis adversus hæreticos et fidei definitionibus." See also Dens, Theologia, ii. 142, where it stands the seventeenth in order of the "Concilia Generalia Approbata."

† 2 Tim. iii. 3, ἄσπονδος.

in the University of Prague in Bohemia: being charged with holding the doctrines of John Wickliffe our Oxford Professor, he was cited in A.D. 1414 to the Council which had been convoked to Constance, mainly under the auspices of the Emperor Sigismund, for the purpose of putting an end to the schism of rival Popes which had rent the Church of Rome since the death of Gregory XI. in 1378.

Huss obtained from the Emperor a safe-conduct * *to* and *from* Constance. In it the Emperor states that he has taken Huss "under his own protection and guardianship, and under that of the Sacred Roman Empire," and he directs all Princes Secular and Ecclesiastical to "permit him freely to pass, stay, sojourn and *return* † without any let or hindrance," and to "provide him a safe-conduct, for the honour of the majesty of the Empire."

This Imperial safe-conduct is dated Oct. 18, 1414: it was not a mere *travelling passport*, as some in our days have imagined; for Huss did not receive it till he arrived either at Nuremberg or at Constance ‡; but it was specially for his use *there* and *back*.

On the 3rd of November, 1414, Huss arrived at Con-

* A copy of the original is preserved in vol. iv. p. 12, of Von der Hardt's Concil. Constant. Francofurti, 1699.

† "Omni prorsus impedimento remoto, transire, stare, morari et *redire* liberè permittatis."

‡ See Lenfant, Histoire du Concile de Constance; Liv. iv. c. 81. tom. i. p. 287, ed. Amst. 1727.

stance, and his safe-conduct was shown to the Pope, John XXIII. who declared that, even if Huss "had been guilty of murdering his (the Pope's) brother, he would protect him, and would not permit, as far as in him lay, that any injury should be done him while he was at Constance*." On the 28th, Huss is put into the Episcopal prison without any hearing of his cause: on the 10th of December, Sigismund orders the Pope to discharge him; on the 2nd of January, Huss is put into a worse dungeon, from which he is removed to another on March 3rd, and thence to the castle of Gotleben, whence he is brought back to Constance on the 5th of June, 1415, when he was publickly heard for the first time. He was tried, condemned, and degraded by the Council in the Cathedral of Constance, on Saturday the 6th of July, 1415, in the presence of the Emperor himself, who gave his *placet* to the sentence, although it is related that he *blushed* for shame when John Huss said in his defence, fixing his eyes on the Emperor †,

* Von der Hardt, vol. iv. p. 11.

It should be stated in justice to John XXIII., that the Pope was deposed before Huss was burnt.

† "Hæc cum loqueretur, oculos in Imperatorem defixos habuit, ille vero statim vehementer erubuit." See the contemporary record in Von der Hardt, iv. 391. In allusion to this blush of Sigismund, the Emperor Charles V. when solicited by Eccius and others to arrest Luther at the diet of Worms, notwithstanding the safe-conduct he had given him—"No," said he, "I do not wish to blush with Sigismund my predecessor."—Lenfant, i. p. 401.

Louis the Elector Palatine declared at Worms that he desired the promise given under his own hand and seal to be regarded as in-

'I came free to this Council, having received a public pledge from the Emperor, who is here present, that I should be safe from all violence, in order that I might testify my innocence, and give a reason of my faith to every one who should ask it." Huss was then conducted to the stake, where he was burnt; and his ashes were thrown into the Rhine.

Here, perhaps, the Council supposed would be an end of John Huss; no more, as they imagined, would be heard of him, and of their conduct towards him; all recollection of it would be carried away with his ashes by the stream, and lost in the German Ocean. But they were mistaken; all Bohemia was soon in commotion; the Emperor's name became a byword with the people; and the Council was loaded with execration. The Emperor was compelled to indite an apologetic letter to the Bohemian nobles, in which he alleges as an excuse, that, if he had interfered in behalf of Huss, the Council would have dissolved itself, and that all the designs with which it was summoned would thus have been frustrated *. Such was Sigismund's plea

violable, "for," said he, "they who did not keep their promise to Huss, never prospered from that time to this."—Ibid. p 410.

* See the original in Lenfant ii. 450. Sigismund says that, "he often *did* interpose in behalf of Huss, and that he was often obliged to leave the Council in a rage" (furore percitus). "Neque enim licuit nobis ulterius pro hoc negotio loqui, quia exinde Concilium totaliter fuisset dissolutum." This letter was written in 1417, *after* the Decree mentioned in the text, which was intended to quiet the conscience of Sigismund, as well as to quell the rebellion of Bohemia.

The Council, by an *ex post facto* law passed more than two months *after* the martyrdom of Huss, decreed on September 23, 1415, "That notwithstanding safe-conducts given by Emperors and Kings, the Competent Judge may enquire into cases of heretical pravity*; that by such safe-conducts no prejudice can be created against the Catholic Faith, or against the Jurisdiction of the Church; so that, notwithstanding such safe-conduct, the competent Ecclesiastical Judge may enquire concerning the errors of such persons, and proceed duly against them, and punish them, as far as justice shall dictate, if they obstinately refuse to *recant*† their errors, even though they have come to the place of trial *relying on the safe-conduct*, and *otherwise would not have come.*"

It was also decreed, that "the party who has promised safety does not remain bound by his promise, when in other respects he has done what in him lay."

Such is the *first* decree of the Council of Constance concerning the validity of safe-conducts.

Let me observe upon it; *first*, that it cannot be interpreted without reference to the circumstances

* See the original in Labbe, Concil. xii. 169; Von der Hardt, iv. 522, and in the Appendix to this Letter, K.

† It is scarcely credible, but documents prove the fact, that a sentence of perpetual imprisonment would have been passed on Huss, *even if he had recanted*. See the draft of *this* sentence in Von der Hardt, iv. p. 432.

which led to it. The true commentary upon it is to be found in the treatment which Huss had received from the Emperor, and from the Council itself.

Next, the public opinion of contemporary witnesses is a fair criterion of the honesty of a public act; and this opinion must have been, and we know it was, very strongly pronounced *against* the Council, or it never would have been induced to interrupt the order of its proceedings, and to frame this exculpatory decree, when Huss had been dead nearly three months.

Let us now examine the decree. It affirms that it shall be lawful for the Ecclesiastical Judge to punish heretics, notwithstanding that they may have come to the place of judgment with a safe-conduct from temporal princes, and would *not have come to it, unless* they had received this safe-conduct.

Such is the Decree; now for the practical comment upon it. John Huss received a safe-conduct from the Emperor Sigismund, the Convoker of the Council of Constance, and the principal secular Agent in all its proceedings, and such a safe-conduct as guaranteed his safe *return* to his country; and he was arrested and imprisoned unheard, and kept in prison for half a year, and then condemned as a heretic, and delivered over to the secular arm to be burnt; and the Emperor Sigismund, it is said by the Council, was not bound by his promise to give him *any more* protection than he did!

The Dublin Reviewer defies "any one, *except* the Canon of Westminster, to explain this decree to mean any thing but that faith *must* be kept with heretics."

As he has paid me the compliment of making an honourable exception in my favour, I have taken advantage of this privilege, and have stated the circumstances which led to the Decree, and have cited the Decree itself; and I *now* put it to the common sense and probity of any man, and I will not insult the Reviewer by making an exception against him, whether it is not evident from the Decree, taken together with the acts which *preceded* it, that according to the teaching of the Church of Rome in the Council of Constance, "Faith is not to be kept with heretics, to the *prejudice of the Church?*"

But this is not all. *This* Decree which I have just cited, is a general one, though occasioned by a particular case; but the Reviewer does not seem to be aware that the same Council passed a *second* Decree of a *special* character, in which it affirmed in the most explicit terms, that "*faith* is not to be kept with heretics, to the prejudice of the Church." His "flat denial" of my assertion requires me to adduce this also. It is entitled "*A Special Decree concerning the safe-conduct given to Huss by the Emperor.*"

"The *Holy Synod decrees: Forasmuch as certain persons presumptuously or with a sinister intention, or wishing † to be wise above what is right, not only calumniate the Emperor, but also this Sacred Council with slanderous tongues, publicly and secretly saying or insinuating that the safe-conduct given by the most Invincible Prince Sigismund, King of the Romans, Hungary, &c. to John Huss, the Heresiarch, of execrable memory, was unduly violated, contrary to justice or honour; although the said John Huss, by obstinately impugning the orthodox faith, forfeited ‡ all safe-conduct and privileges, and *no faith* or promise was *to be kept* with him by natural Law, either human or divine, *to the prejudice* of the *Catholic Faith;* therefore, the said Holy Synod declares by the tenor of these presents, that the said most Invincible Prince, with respect to the said John Huss, notwithstanding the said safe-conduct, did what he could and what became his Imperial Majesty; and it enjoins and commands all and singular Christians of whatever dignity, grade, pre-eminence, condition, state or sex, that no one henceforth shall slander or in any way disparage the Sacred Council

* The original, cited in the Appendix to this Letter, L., is in Von der Hardt, iv. p. 522. (See his Proleg. iv. p. 14.) Lenfant, ii. p. 452. See also his Apologie, p. 15; and Courayer's Note to his Translation of Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, i. 678.

† For *solentes*, which is erroneous, I read *volentes*.

‡ "Se reddiderit alienum ab omni salvo conductu:" a somewhat circuitous expression.

or the Imperial Majesty for their deeds in the matter of John Huss: and that whosoever transgresses this command, shall be punished without pardon as an abettor of Heresy, and guilty of high Treason."

Such is the *second* Decree of the Sacred Œcumenical Synod of Constance, concerning John Huss; it will, I imagine, require a strong disturbing force of "Title and Gloss" to make this Canon mean that "faith *must* be kept with heretics."

Perhaps, Sir, I may now be allowed to say one word once for all on the tone of self-satisfaction, in which the Dublin Reviewer, at the commencement of his Article, speaks of his own work.

> Dr. Wordsworth has confidence in his cause, and a supply of passages to make it good, but is not at all scrupulous as to the real meaning of his quotations; he gives them a meaning himself, and that one as far removed from that of the writer whom he cites as it can possibly be. Having no time for a more particular observation of these Letters, which we find now in a second edition, we confine ourselves to the bare exposing of blunders, which we are afraid our readers will give us credit for inventing, rather than suppose Dr. Wordsworth guilty of such dulness as to have committed them himself.

It would appear from these words, that the Critic has no misgivings about himself: he has not much time to spare, but quite enough for his purpose—to show his own wisdom, and my simplicity. But

> Quid tulit hoc tanto dignum promissor hiatu?

What has he *performed?* He tells us what he *will* do. "We will confine ourselves," he says, "to the bare

exposing of blunders, which we are afraid our readers will give us credit for *inventing*." Perhaps he has already seen that his fears were not groundless; and if he reads to the end of these Letters he may find them fully realized. And yet his brother Reviewer in the Tablet is full of admiration of his work. "The Article in the Dublin Review *" (he says) "is the most damning exposure of wilful negligence, affected ignorance, or determined misrepresentation we ever witnessed;" and so, my dear Sir, we have the old Roman story revived;

> Frater erat Romæ Consulti Rhetor, ut alter
> Alterius sermone meros audiret honores;
> Gracchus ut hic illi foret, huic ut Mucius ille †.

And I dare say that if Gracchus should find time to "invent" any more "blunders" for me, and to make any more for himself, his brother Mucius will be ready at hand to laud him again to the skies.

But to return. It is quite true that, in spite of these decrees of a so called Infallible Council, some of the Divines of Rome, like the Dublin Reviewer, persist in affirming that the doctrine of that Church is, that "Faith is to be kept with heretics."

Thus for example, Becanus the famous Jesuit Teacher does not scruple to affirm most confidently, and falsely,—that "all Catholics say with one consent that faith is to be kept with heretics ‡.

* Tablet, May 29, 1847.

† Hor. Ep. ii. 2. 87.

‡ Becanus, Diss. Theol. c. 12. § 5. "Affirmant uno consensu omnes

But on the *other* hand it is to be observed, first, that other no less eminent Romish Teachers teach that "Faith is *not* to be so kept."

For example, the Reviewer's friend Albert Pighius declares boldly, that "it is impious and heretical to affirm that it is heresy to say that subjects may be absolved from Oaths of Allegiance to their sovereigns *," and he declares that "the Pope may absolve subjects from such oaths."

Again; the celebrated Cardinal Hosius frequently exhorts the King of Poland to exterminate heretics, notwithstanding his oath to protect them! "You," says the Cardinal, "must not on any account *allow this promise to be kept*, for an oath must not be a bond of iniquity †."

Again; Simanca, the Portuguese Bishop, who is one of the most celebrated doctors of Rome, in his Catholic Institutions against Heresy thus writes. "Justly therefore were certain heretics burnt in lawful flames by the solemn sentence of the Council of Constance, *although security had been promised them* ‡:" and he teaches § most expressly "that faith, although

Catholici debere hæreticis servari fidem, sive salvus conductus concedatur jure communi sive speciali." Compare Archbishop Laud against Fisher, sect. 21. § vii. note.

* Hierarch. Eccles. V. c. 15. p. 266.

† Epistolæ ad Regem Polonum, 193. 202. 280. See Appendix M.

‡ Simanca, Inst. 46. § 52. "Jure . . . legitimâ flammâ, concremati sunt, quamvis promissa illis securitas fuisset."

§ Ibid. tit. 46. § 52. "Ad pœnam pertinet hæreticorum, quod

confirmed by oath, is not to be kept with heretics, contrary to spiritual good."

But what is more than all this—the Bishop of Rome himself teaches from his Pontifical chair in his own Canon Law, published under Papal authority, *not ten years ago* *, that "No oath is to be kept, which is to the prejudice of the Church of Rome," and that "oaths which are against the interest of that Church are not oaths, but perjuries," and that "subjects may justly resist their sovereign in defence of its honours and privileges," and that "no one owes any allegiance to excommunicate persons," and that "all who were bound to them are released from their obligations," and are *prohibited* from performing what they have sworn to do.

fides illis data servanda non sit :" and again, "fides illis data etiam juramento firmata contra publicum bonum, contra salutem animarum *nullo modo servanda est.*"

* The following are the words of the Original in the Edition of 1839.

Tom. ii. p. 358. "Juramentum contra utilitatem Ecclesiasticam non tenet."

ibid. "Non juramenta sed perjuria potius sunt dicenda quæ contra utilitatem Ecclesiasticam attentantur."

ii. p. 360. "Vos juramento hujusmodi non tenemini quin pro juribus et honoribus ipsius Ecclesiæ contra ipsum Principem stare liberè valeatis."

i. p. 648. "Eos qui excommunicatis fidelitate aut sacramento constricti sunt, a sacramento absolvimus."

i. p. 648. "Fidelitatem quam Christiano Principi jurarunt, Deo ejusque sanctis adversanti, nullâ cohibentur auctoritate persolvere."

ibid. "Ne fidelitatem observent, omnibus modis prohibemus."

Such, Sir, are the dictates of your Infallible Judge himself.

Lastly, From a decree of the Council of Trent in the year 1562, it is evident what interpretation was given both by Protestants and the Church of Rome to the decrees above cited of the Council of Constance. These decrees, together with the memory of the fate of Huss, deterred the Protestants, as they well might do, from going to Trent. What then did the Council do? It *repealed* them *for that time* (pro hâc vice), and thus declared its own sense of their meaning *.

Here therefore you see, my dear Sir, what your Church teaches concerning a great moral question; she declares by the voice of her General Councils and of her Supreme Pontiffs, that "faith is not to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the Church."

Since also she admits no other judgment but her own, concerning the important point, *What* is to the prejudice of the Church? it is clear, that according to her, "Faith is not to be kept with heretics in anything which the Church of Rome *declares* to be prejudicial to herself."

* Concil. Trid. Sess. xviii. (Streitwolf, ii. p. 108.) "Sacro-Sancta Synodus promittit ipsam nullam occasionem quæsituram aliqua auctoritate &c. quorumcunque Conciliorum præsertim *Constantiensis* et Senensis in aliquod hujus fidei publicæ per synodum concessæ præjudicium, quibus (*i.e.* Conciliis) in hâc parte *pro hâc vice* derogat."—See Archbishop Laud against Fisher, sect. 21. § vii. Note.

It follows then, that if you obey her teaching, you are in danger of being called upon to perform acts of perfidy, from which many heathens would have shrunk with execration.

It follows also, that though *you* may not be commanded to act thus, yet that by teaching such doctrines, *she* is as much guilty as if she were at this moment calling upon you, and upon all her members, to act upon them; and that you and they cannot be safe, as moral agents, in submitting to her authority and surrendering yourselves to her guidance.

Thirdly, if you declare that you would not break your word, if she commanded you to do so on the plea that her interest requires such a violation of your promise, then you overthrow the foundation on which the whole Papal system is built, and on which your own faith rests; for you deny the Infallibility of your Church, which teaches you by her Popes and Councils, that "Faith is not to be kept with heretics to her prejudice;" and therefore by the right exercise of your moral sense, you destroy the grounds of your Religion, and are in danger of falling into scepticism!

And, lastly, let me observe, that by this principle, the Church of Rome betrays her *destructive character* with respect to Sovereigns and all Civil Governments, in two ways; first, by sapping the foundations of civil allegiance on which all Government

rests. If faith is not to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of Rome, then, at any moment, Sovereigns may find themselves to be without subjects. For, either they may be already regarded by Rome as heretics, as the Sovereigns of England are, and so, by her doctrine, no allegiance is due to them at all, and particularly none, whenever Rome affirms that such allegiance is prejudicial to her interests; or they may at any time be *declared* by her to be heretics, and so forfeit their claim to any fealty from their subjects.

It cannot therefore be denied, that, as long as Rome holds this doctrine, any acts on our part of favour and encouragement to her are wholly irreconcilable with our duties to our Sovereigns, and to Almighty God, Whose ministers they are.

It may perhaps be alleged, that by acts of countenance and conciliation, Sovereigns and Governments may have Rome as their ally.

You, my dear Sir, have a fearful warning against such policy as this, as I have before observed, in your own history. Your two Kings, Henry III. and Henry IV., being alarmed by the power of Rome acting upon their subjects, yielded to their fears, and thought to save themselves by making compromises with her; and what was the consequence? They were visited with the righteous judgment of an offended God, punishing them for their want of trust in Him, and for relying on the deceitful patronage of Rome

instead of reposing stedfastly on *His* sure defence. They tarnished their glory by their weakness, and lost His favour; and both of them perished miserably by the hands of Romish assassins.

On the other hand; As if Almighty God had intended to teach Sovereigns and Governments *where* true protection, even of their persons, is to be found, He "Who has in all ages showed His power and mercy in the miraculous and gracious deliverances of His Church, and in the protection of righteous and religious Kings and States professing His holy and eternal Truth from the wicked conspiracies and malicious practices of their enemies*," rescued the contemporary Sovereign of *England* from all plots against her *person*, which, even if they had been successful, as Rome intended they should be, would have had no power against her immortal *soul*. And although Queen Elizabeth had fallen by the hand of Story, or of Parry†, she would have been infinitely more to be blessed not only in spiritual, but also in temporal respects, than your Henry III. or Henry IV., even if they had escaped unhurt from the murderous knife of the Friar Jaques Clement, and of the Jesuit Francis Ravaillac.

Let us also look at the *destruction* of what is far more precious than life—I mean of *good name*—

* Book of Common Prayer. A Form of Prayer, &c., for the Fifth Day of November.

† See Letters, p. 338.

which Rome has wrought in the case of those Sovereigns and States who have aimed to conciliate her. They stand, in history, like the example of the unhappy Saul, forsaken and rejected, and, as a last resource, taking counsel of a familiar spirit. Rome has shown no regard for the fame any more than for the peace of mind, or for the soul's health of her Royal and Imperial Vassals*; but she appears to have a savage pleasure in sacrificing their honour, and in recklessly and ruthlessly condemning them to eternal infamy for the attainment of her own ends. You may remember the dying words of Rudolph, Duke of Swabia: "You see," he said, "this bleeding right hand; with it I swore allegiance to the Emperor Henry: but the command of the Pope (Gregory VII.) obliged me to break my oath, and to usurp his Crown. In the hand with which I committed perjury, in the same hand am I now mortally wounded. Let them look to it who urged me on to that traitorous deed: have they not brought me now to the brink of everlasting perdition†?" Rome was the Tempter who led him to

* Schioppius said (Eccles. 127) of Romanist princes, that they are "Asini cum tintinnabulo," from their making themselves palfreys to the Pope, who gives them a bell to jangle about their necks; but this is a very innocent employment to what many of them have had to perform.

† Helmolder's Chronic. ad A.D. 1080, cited by the Abbé La Bastide, in his notes to Fleury's Discours sur les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, p. 31.

that crime and to that abyss. Rome blasted the reputation of the Emperor Sigismund at Constance, and set him the cruel task of lighting the flames to burn the man whom he had promised to protect. Rome made Catherine of France, and her son Charles IX., the executioners of the Huguenot Nobles and Gentry, whom they had decoyed to Paris, to celebrate a marriage! Rome called up the Queen at the dead of night, and sounded the bell which was the signal for the commencement of that perfidious massacre; and Rome gave public thanks for it, in a Christian Church, as for a glorious victory*!

Such is the service in which she has employed the Sovereigns who caress her. She has degraded them into slaves, and given them as sanguinary work to do, as was ever performed by the chief turnkey of the Bastille in its darkest day, or by the principal agent of the Guillotine in the Reign of Terror.

It is not for men to scrutinize closely the judgments of God. It is not for them to say that such or such a visitation is the punishment of such or such a crime. Still less is it for us to determine the time *when* the wrath of Heaven will be poured out for sin. But it *is* our *duty* to revere, and to

* See Letters to M. Gondon, pp. 336, 337. A private letter also of Cardinal Hosius shows with what feelings of exultation the news of that massacre were received at Rome. See Appendix N.

meditate upon the unerring word of Inspiration, and to judge of human conduct by its laws; and to believe its declarations, that national sins, if unrepented, will be visited with national punishments.

It cannot therefore be doubted, that the sins of Rome (for *sins* they are, if the Word of God is true), will, if not forsaken, bring, in God's own time, punishments upon her proportionate to their magnitude; nor can it be questioned that a Nation which trafficks and tampers with her, and endeavours to make use of her unrighteous and ungodly power for its own political ends, and thus *recognizes* that power, and *relies* upon it, cannot be an object of the approval of Heaven; and that in proportion as a Nation is blessed with a readier access to the Word of God, so, by acting thus, is it exposing itself to severer chastisement; and *that* Nation will probably find that Rome herself will be used by Almighty God as a scourge for its punishment; till at length Rome, if courted by Monarchies, will overthrow them all, and become in the end the Victim of that Democratical and Infidel Power which the destructive principles of Rome have already engendered and fostered, and are now animating* and strength-

* This is clear from the democratical language of almost all the Ultramontane writers of Europe at this time, and from the encouragement which anti-monarchical principles and practices are now receiving from Rome. The late Agitator of Ireland is lauded at Rome in a funeral Oration, rehearsed in the Pope's presence, as a Christian Hero and a Saint; and this Oration is ushered into the

ening with new confidence and life, and will one day be seen to have armed against herself.

I am, Sir,

&c. &c.

world with the commendation of the Theological Censor of the Vatican, and it is received with enthusiasm by Bishops of France. See Appendix O. It is remarkable that the Author of this funeral Oration delivered and published also a Panegyric at the same time, in which he declares that Pope Paul III. by convoking the Council of *Trent* effected a genuine *Reformation* of the Church! See also Appendix O.

LETTER VIII.

"Si Unus Universalis est, restat ut vos Episcopi non sitis."—GREGORIUS I. Papa.

MY DEAR SIR,

Such was the declaration made by Pope Gregory the First *, at the end of the sixth century, to the Bishops of Greece, before the Bishops of Rome had assumed the title of Universal Bishop; and when he was warning them of the consequence which would follow from its assumption by the then Bishop of Constantinople; "If he is Universal Bishop," said Gregory, "you will be no Bishops at all." A most remarkable prophecy, fulfilled to the letter in the Church of Rome; which, not long after Gregory's death, saw that title assumed by her own Pontiffs, which he had denounced as Antichristian †.

* Epist. lib. v. 68. tom. ii. 984. ed. Paris, 1705.

† Epist. ii. pp. 771—773. Lib. vii. Ep. xxxiii. See also Lib. iv. 32; v. 20, p. 748; v. 29; vii. 27, p. 873; vii. 31. 34; ix. 68.

Thenceforth the Order and Jurisdiction of Bishops in that Church was gradually more and more weakened till at length it was merged in the Papacy; and instead of a Union of Bishops, there remained no Bishop, but the Pope *.

As a proof of this absorption of all Episcopal power into the Papal Charybdis, and of this additional development of the *destructive* principles of Rome, I adverted in my Letters to the remarkable fact, that if a Roman Catholic Bishop is promoted to an Archbishopric, all his Episcopal power immediately falls into abeyance, and he is incapacitated from performing any Episcopal act, till he receives the Pallium from Rome; and if he fails to obtain it, he can never exercise more any Episcopal function; but his Episcopal authority is as it were stifled, and dies.

That any *one* Bishop should claim to be the dispenser of *all* Episcopal power *throughout the world*, is irreconcileable with the Divine Institution of Episcopacy; but that he should also pretend to *revoke* it, and to reassume it into himself, and to inhibit its exercise till he has vouchsafed to make a new grant of it to its former lessee, (for every Romish Bishop

* Bp. Pearson, Opera Postuma, i. 274. Nihil certius est quam omnem deminutionem ordinis Episcopalis originem trahere ab *usurpatione Papali*; nihilque aliud mihi videtur Papa Romanus quam unus homo vindicans sibi omnem auctoritatem concessam Episcopis per totum orbem.

† Letters, p. 314.

is only a *copyholder* under the *Pope*, and not a *freeholder* under *Christ*,) is so monstrous an example of arrogance, and outrage against human liberty and divine honour, that if it had not been predicted in prophecy, and visibly displayed in practice, its existence would not be believed.

Reflect, Sir, for a moment on the fact, that according to this claim, no Church could be consecrated, no Clergyman ordained, no Child confirmed, throughout the whole Roman World, if it so pleased the Pope.

This brings me to the next remark of the Dublin Reviewer:—

Page 314. "No Romanist archbishop can consecrate a church, or *confirm a child*, without receiving the *Pallium* from Rome." This assertion Dr. Wordsworth supports by a quotation from the Pontifical, and the words which he considers equivalent to "confirm a child" are *chrisma conficere*, which mean, not confirmation, but the blessing of the oils on Maundy Thursday. Such is the learning of a man who writes a book of more than 300 pages on the destructive character of the Church of Rome!

Let me first observe here that the Reviewer, instead of encountering my main assertion, turns aside to a mere verbal criticism, which shall be shown presently to be worthless. If he had been able to vindicate the Pope from the charge of tyrannically usurping the rights of his brethren, and invading the prerogative of Christ Himself, from Whom all

ministerial power flows, he would have done something worth the doing; but here, as in the rest of his strictures, by venturing upon them he has shown that he *would* have attacked my *main* positions if they were not impregnable, and thus he has proved the strength of that which he desires to impugn; and by the abortiveness of his assaults upon these mere outlying portions of my argument, he has exposed more glaringly the imbecility of that cause which he undertakes to maintain; while at the same time he elicits fresh demonstrations of "the destructive character of the Church of Rome both in Religion and Polity."

To turn now to the passage in the Pontifical, the authorized book of the Priesthood of Rome. The words of the original * are, "Ante quàm quis obtinuerit Pallium, licet sit consecratus, . . . non licet ei Episcopos consecrare, nec convocare Concilium, nec Chrisma conficere, neque Ecclesias dedicare, nec Clericos ordinare," that is, in few words, he cannot perform *any Episcopal act:* and since the acts which are commonly best known as Episcopal in this country are Consecrations of Churches and Confirmations of Children, I selected those acts as exemplifying the *meaning* of the Order in the Pontifical; and since "*blessing the oils,*" as he terms it, is *not* commonly known to English readers as an

* P. 87. ed. Rom. A.D. 1818.

Episcopal function at all, I should not have specified that, even if it were contained in the passage in question.

"But the words," says the Reviewer, "which Dr. Wordsworth considers equivalent to 'confirm a child, are chrisma conficere,' which mean not Confirmation, but the *blessing of the oils* on Maundy Thursday."

I wonder he did not rather say that the words I considered equivalent to confirm a child are "Clericos ordinare," for they, and not "Chrisma conficere," stand next in the Pontifical, after "Ecclesias dedicare."

But after his animadversion on my alleged translation of the words *Chrisma conficere*, I must beg leave to inform him that he does not understand them himself. The term *Chrisma conficere* does *not* mean "the blessing of the oils," as he renders it, but the "confection of the Chrism," which is a very different thing. The Chrism is made of balsam and olive oil; and he will find the proper recipe for it in the Trent Catechism *, which will give him a full account of its uses and meaning; and then he will be able to instruct others in that matter.

The Reviewer speaks of the *benediction* of the oils on Maundy Thursday; and this recalls to the memory another purpose for which that solemn day is commanded by Roman Pontiffs to be used, I mean

* Pars ii. cap. iii. Qu. 6. *Chrisma*, unguenti genus quod ex oleo et balsamo *conficitur*. Qu. 6. Neque ad alium ea *confectio* nisi ad Episcopum pertinet.

the *malediction* of all Protestants, who are made the object of the most bitter curses in the bull which derives its name from that sacred anniversary*. But I pass to another topic.

The Reviewer next says:—

We conclude our ungrateful labours with a historical inaccuracy of our scholar, which may be found in p. 285, where he says, "that the Pope not only indirectly deprived Louis XVIII. of his crown, but that he *placed it with his own hands on the head of Napoleon.*" It is very well known that Buonaparte saved the pope this trouble; for, says M. Thiers, he "saisit la couronne des mains du Pontife, sans brusquerie, mais avec décision, et la plaça lui-même sur sa tête." (Hist. du Consulat. liv. 20. tom. v. p. 266. Paris, 1845.)

Here again let me observe, the Reviewer declines to say a word on the main question in debate, and turns aside to catch at a straw. My argument was, that the Papal claim to alter forms of Government and to deprive Sovereigns of their Thrones is by no means *obsolete*, as some persons would represent it to be; for it has been exercised in *your country*, in *our own days*. It is shown in my Letters to you†, that Pius the Seventh, who became Pope in the year 1800, publicly acknowledged Louis XVIII. as King of France in that year: but that the very next year he was induced by Napoleon to issue a bull, commanding all the Bishops and Clergy of

* Bulla In Cœnâ Domini.

† P. 284—286.

France to take an oath of allegiance to the *Republic.*

Thus the Pope claimed to exercise a power to cancel allegiance to a King whom he himself had recognized, and to transfer it to a Republic in his room.

Nor was this all. Napoleon, when he was in Egypt in 1798, had declared himself a disciple of Mahomet, and had joined in the public worship of Infidels*; and yet the Bishop of Rome, in a speech made in the Consistory of Cardinals, and published by himself, did on the 29th of October, 1804, call Napoleon his very dear Son in Christ †! "He," said Pius VII., "has signified to us his ardent desire to be anointed by us with holy oil, and to receive from our hands the Imperial Crown, so that the sacred powers which are about to place him in so high an eminence, may be stamped with the character of Religion, and may invoke on him more powerfully the blessings of Heaven. You see therefore, venerable brethren, how just and grave are the causes which move us to undertake this journey to Paris to crown him ‡."

* See the details in Scott's Napoleon, chap. xxxi.

† See the Speech in Botta's Istoria d'Italia, vol. xi. libr. xxi. p. 93, ed. 1831.

‡ Ibid. p. 93 :—"Viene a noi significandoci ardentemente desiderare di essere coi santi olij unto e *dalle mani nostre* l'imperiale corona ricevere, acciochè i sacri diritti, che sono in così alto grado per collocarlo, siano col carattere della Religione impressi e potentemente sopra di lui le celesti benedizioni appellino." "Voi vedete

Observe, Sir, this, I pray you; the Pope says to his assembled Cardinals that it is a just and worthy enterprise for him to travel to Paris, to place the crown of France on the head of one who had proclaimed himself an Apostate*, and to invoke upon him the blessings of Heaven in a Christian Church!

But this was not enough: the Pope did go. He set out from Rome on the 2nd of November. In the winter of 1804 he crossed the Alps and crowned Napoleon Emperor of the French, in the Cathedral Church of Nôtre Dame, on Advent Sunday, the 2nd of December, 1804.

Nor was this all. After his return from Paris, he again summoned the Cardinals on the 26th of June, 1805: and in an Allocution, which he afterwards published †, he declared that "ever since he had come back from France, he had desired to call them together to a Consistory, in order that as he had informed them before of his intention to crown his most dear son in Christ, Napoleon, so he might now declare to them, without delay, the beneficial results which had been derived, by God's aid, from that journey."

"I was impelled," he says, "with a most ardent

pertanto, venerabili fratelli, quanto giuste e gravi siano le cagioni che ad intraprendere questo viaggio c'invitano."

* "Il avait apostasié par la profession du Mahométanisme."—Etat Politique de France, 1806, p. 71.

† The original Latin may be seen in pp. 2—21, of l'Etat Politique et Religieux de France, Lond. 1806.

desire of seeing and inaugurating the Emperor, and of settling with him the affairs of Religion; for which purposes, waiving all difficulties, I undertook so long a journey*."

He describes his route from Rome to Lyons, thence to Fontainebleau, thence to Paris. "At Paris," he says, "on the day appointed, which was the 2nd of December, and the first Sunday in Advent, amidst the triumphal exultations of that city and of the whole of France, and with magnificent pomp, the Consecration and Coronation of the Emperor was performed with solemn ceremonies†."

Such is the Pope's account, in his own words, of the Coronation and Benediction of Napoleon: and relying upon their truth, and referring to them as my authority, I wrote the paragraph on which the Reviewer animadverts.

What does the Reviewer himself say to all this?

The Pope, he affirms, did not put the crown on Napoleon's head with *his own hands:* or as he expresses it, somewhat inconsistently with a reverence for Popes, "It is well known that Buonaparte *saved* the Pope *this trouble;*" and then he quotes M. Thiers, who relates that Napoleon seized the crown, without rudeness but with decision, from the

* L'Etat Politique et Religieux de France, Lond. 1806, p. 6:— "Ardentissimo desiderio impellebamur ad Imperatorem conveniendum et inaugurandum, pertractandaque cum eo religionis negotia, quas ob res tantum iter omni difficultate posthabitâ suscepimus."

† Ibid. p. 7.

hands of the Pontiff, and placed it himself on his own head."

Be it so: let M. Thiers be right*, and the Pope be wrong; let Napoleon *not* have been crowned by Pius VII.; let the Pope's speech to the Cardinals, in which he gives them and the world to understand that "the Consecration and Coronation were performed with sacred and solemn rites†," be an incorrect representation of the matter: yet then, first, the Pope is now placed by the Reviewer in the unhappy position of a man who has given an inaccurate account of an affair in which he was one of the principal parties; and, secondly, though it be true, that Napoleon despised and insulted the Pope, while he employed him as his instrument; though it be true, that the Emperor made the Pope wait for an hour in Nôtre Dame before he himself thought fit to appear; and treated him openly with disdain‡ in

* Yet a contemporary French writer, who enters very minutely into the particulars of the coronation, says:—"Il reçut des mains du Pape la couronne impériale." L'Etat Politique de France, Lond. 1806, p. 66.

† The Pope's own words are: "Sacro solemnique ritu consecratio et coronatio peracta est;" and "augustâ hujusmodi cæremoniâ expeditâ animum ad pertractanda religionis negotia statim convertimus." The Pope says not a word about Napoleon having *crowned himself;* and by calling the coronation an "august ceremony performed with sacred and solemn rites," and by describing it as *the* ceremony, to perform which he himself went to Paris (see above, p. 171), he leads every one who reads his speech to suppose that he had performed it with *his own hands.*

‡ See the circumstances mentioned by Botta, Istoria, p. 97; who does not, however, mention that Napoleon crowned himself.

the presence of the people; though it be also true, that Napoleon* placed the crown on his own head, yet it is certain, from the Pope's own words, that *he intended* to crown the apostate usurper with his own Pontifical hands, and that he went to Paris for that express purpose, and that *he would have* crowned him, if he had been permitted to do so; and that he *did* crown him *as far as he was able* so to do; and that he not only affirmed that he intended to crown him, but also publicly implied, that he had done the deed.

Therefore, whether he did crown him or no, his *guilt* is the same,

> "Nam scelus intrà se tacitè qui *cogitat* ullum,
> *Facti* crimen habet:"

but his *shame* is so much the greater, if he did *not* actually crown him, as the Reviewer affirms he did not; for he is thus shown to have exposed himself to be publicly treated with well-deserved scorn by the tyrannical power which used him as an instrument; and also, perhaps, from a consciousness of having too well merited the indignity, to have given an incorrect account to the world of the event, in that memorable Allocution, wherein he "gloried in his shame."

Let me now put it to you, my dear Sir, whether my assertions concerning this matter have been

* See Sir W. Scott's Life of Napoleon, chap. xlviii. "The Crown having been blessed by the Pope, Napoleon took it from the altar with his own hands, and placed it on his brows."

invalidated by the Reviewer; or, on the contrary, has he not damaged the cause he has undertaken to defend?

But, Sir, I have something more important to do in this Sequel to my Letters to you, than to substantiate my own assertions, or to refute his objections merely so far as he and I are personally concerned. I write not for self-vindication, much less, I hope, in vindictiveness. My object is a public one: and looking at the important facts brought out by the Reviewer's last remark, I would offer a brief comment upon them, applicable, as it seems to me, to our own times.

From them it is clear, that the Papacy was willing to lend itself to exercise its self-claimed deposing and absolving power *against* the King of France, whom it had saluted as the most Christian King a short time before,—the successor of fifty Kings,—and *in favour*, first, of a *Regicidal* and *Infidel Republic;* and, secondly, of an *apostate Usurper.*

These, Sir, are not facts of the middle ages; but of *our own times.*

The Papacy acted thus, not from fear of Napoleon *, as some have imagined, but from two other very different motives.

First, as being glad to have its deposing and

* If I may be permitted to refer to my Diary in France, p. 9, it will be seen, from the facts there stated, that this was *not* the motive.

absolving power thus recognized by the French Republic and by the Imperial Conqueror, and to have it called into operation in changing the government of States*.

The present Archbishop of Paris writes thus explicitly on this important subject †.

"Napoleon invited the Sovereign Pontiff to Paris, not that the Pope might do for him what the Archbishops of Rheims had done for the ancient Monarchs of France. He did not wish merely for a splendid ceremony, but for a solemn act, which might be regarded by Catholics as a recognition and indirect approbation from the Pope of his right to wear the Imperial Crown. The most ingenious advocates of the Gallican Liberties would have much difficulty in discovering any real difference between the *meaning* of the Coronation of Napoleon by Pius VII., and that sense which Ultramontanes attach to the indirect power of the Head of the Church over Crowns. This power does not consist in the *direct* collation of the Supreme authority by the Bishop of Rome, but in a declaration from the Pope that such or such a Ruler will exercise that authority in the manner

* Pius VII. in 1805, in his Instructions to the Papal Nuncio at Vienna, openly asserted this right. See History of the Jesuits, Lond. 1816, vol. i. p. 20.

† De l'Appel comme d'Abus, par M. l'Archevêque de Paris. Paris, 1845, p. 292. See Appendix to this Letter, P.

most beneficial to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the country. The Coronation of Napoleon was as striking a declaration of this power as the most explicit Papal Bull concerning the interests of France and her Emperor."

Such, your Archbishop truly says, was Napoleon's purpose in calling the Pope to Paris; and such was one of the Pope's motives in obeying the call.

But, secondly, the Pope had ulterior aims, as he himself declares. "I earnestly desired," he says to his Cardinals, "to inaugurate the Emperor, and to settle with him the affairs of Religion *." It was for the good of the Church of Rome and of the Apostolic See †, that he undertook his journey; and on his return to Rome he expressed his joy ‡ and thankfulness that he had been able to promote their interests by it.

In furtherance of this object, the same Pontiff restored the Order of Jesuits in 1814, and re-established the Inquisition in 1815.

Now, let us remember that the Realm of France

* See Papal Bull of the 7th of Aug. 1814, in Const. S. J. Lond. 1838, p. 127; and the Decree of the Grand Inquisitor Campillo, Madrid, April 5, 1815, given at full length in the History of the Jesuits, i. p. 22, Lond. 1816.

† "*Ad religionis bonum, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem, ad cleri decus*" (p. 9, of the Pope's Allocution); and again, p. 21—"ad religionis incrementum, ad spiritualem animarum salutem, ad Catholicæ Ecclesiæ sedis Apostolicæ bonum."

‡ Ibid. p. 2.

was called by the Popes, "*la fille aînée de l'Eglise,*" and that her Sovereigns were honoured by them with the title "*Le roi très-Chrétien,*" and that Napoleon had, as I have said, professed himself openly an Infidel in Egypt; and recollecting that the Bishop of Rome enjoined the French to take an oath of allegiance to Buonaparte, by which command he absolved them from their fealty to their lawful Sovereign, Louis XVIII.; and that he crowned the one, and thus deposed the other; judging, I say, from these events, which are still fresh in our memories, we have too much reason to believe, that if a Revolutionary power should arise in France, England, or Ireland, and should display its physical force by overturning the Throne and the other Institutions of the country; and if it should appeal to the Pope for his Papal approval of insurrection and usurpation, and should ask for his solemn benediction even upon the heads of Rebels and Infidels; and if he should think that by acceding to this request he will promote the interests of the Papacy,—then, I say, from what he has already done we have too good reason to infer, he will feel no respect whatever for Sovereigns or Nobles, none for person or property; he will not scruple to set out again from Rome and to cross the Alps in the depth of winter; and he will gladly offer himself to be the Hierarch of Revolution; and the so-called Vicar of Christ will prostitute his office and the sacred name of Christianity

in a profane and sacrilegious attempt to sanctify crimes which Religion condemns, and to invoke a blessing from Heaven on the agents of an Antichristian Spirit.

I am,

My dear Sir,

Yours &c. &c. &c.

LETTER IX.

Mentior si non inveniantur hæc scripta et ab illis etiam qui sapientes sunt in oculis suis.—Jo. Gerson. Cancellar. Paris. de Potest. Eccl. Consid. 12.

My Dear Sir,

The Reviewer having, as he says, "concluded his ungrateful labours," and finding, I suppose, on examination, that his conclusions do not amount to much, returns to his work, and resumes it with the following remark:—

In his first edition of these Letters Dr. Wordsworth gave extracts from a document purporting to be a confession of faith propounded to converts in Hungary. In the second he gives the whole document; he considers it genuine, or he does not; that is all we shall say on this point. He describes it in these words: "The following document is a public and an authoritative one; it has even taken its place among the 'Symbolical Books' of the Church of Rome, and I cite it from one of the most recent editions of the dogmatical collections of that

Church." (p. 68.) He then gives his extracts, which are in themselves evidence enough of the forgery, one of them being this, "that they who communicate *in both kinds receive nothing but bare bread*," which is simply an absurdity. Dr. Wordsworth says that this confession has authority, and "has even taken its place among the Symbolical Books of the Church of Rome." The Church of Rome has no "Symbolical Books." That is a Lutheran possession; and if a Protestant chooses to print our canons and catechism, and call them Symbolical Books, we have no help for it: if people will force principles upon us which we abhor, we must submit. In the advertisement to the second edition of his book Dr. Wordsworth tells us, that these Symbolical Books were "edited by two learned members of that Church, Streitwolf and Klener." Whether Streitwolf was a Catholic, or not, matters little; he had nothing to do with editing this confession. Klener calls him "a minister of the Word." He died in 1836. Klener published what Streitwolf had collected, and added to them the whole of the second volume, where this confession is found; and there is no evidence that Streitwolf ever saw it, or knew of its existence. Klener's religion is not very clear; he seems upon the whole to belong to Bunsen's "Church of the Future," to which, or something like it, he dedicates his book, published two years after Streitwolf's death. But what makes the whole affair ridiculous is this, that this confession was drawn up, it is said, by the Jesuits. It seems to be the satirical composition of a Protestant, or of a Catholic representing the Protestant's apprehensions of the Catholic religion: at all events it represents Dr. Wordsworth's *.

* "As an illustration of the learned Canon's temper, we give an extract from this Confession in his own version: 'We confess that the most holy Pontiff ought to be honoured by all with divine

Such is the language of the *Dublin Reviewer*, who is here rejoined by the Writer in the *British Magazine*. The latter having cited my Version of parts of this Confession, thus speaks:—

Now really, before venturing to cite such extravagance and absurdity as this, *as a public and authoritative document*, one would like to know a little more about it, and to have some certainty by whom it was authorized and published—when, where, with what sanction, and under what circumstances it first appeared. All the information that can be found in the work from which Dr. Wordsworth has made his extracts, is contained in the following passage (*Tom.* i. p. li. *prolegom.*): "*Quarta*, [*sc.* fidei professio] cujus *auctor quidem et ætas non satis certo constant* in Hungaria circa annum 1673, per patres societatis Jesu composita esse *videtur*. Sæva hæc formula, a professione fidei Tridentinæ admodum aliena, Evangelicis ad Ecclesiam Romanam revertentibus illic primum præscripta, dein per ipsam Germaniam dilatata est. Textum ejus ex libro Friderici Mohnike supra laudato, p. 88, sqq. repetivimus." Mohnike's work we have not yet seen, but it would require very satisfactory evidence, indeed, to satisfy one that such a performance (whose author and age are uncertain) can be a genuine and authentic document: and if such evidence

honour (*honorari divino honore*), *with more prostration than what is due to Christ himself.*' We should have thought it much safer to translate it thus: 'with the greater genuflection, due to Christ Himself' *majori cum genuflectione, ipsi Christo debita.* The Doctor's own version is doubtless more fitted for his purpose, though in disregard of grammatical laws. Did he leave out the 17th clause because it was overlooked? It is this: 'We confess that the Blessed Virgin Mary is worthy of greater honour from angels and men than Christ Himself, the Son of God;' or would the insertion of this clause make the forgery *too transparent* even in Exeter Hall?" [*Note*, by *the Dublin Reviewer.*]

can be produced, it ought to be laid before the public. Meantime we cannot avoid thinking that if the Jesuits ever did draw up, and publish, and enforce such an extraordinary document as a profession of faith, they have less of caution and discretion than the world has been accustomed to give them credit for.

Let me say a word, in the first place, to the writer in the British Magazine. He says: "Before venturing to *cite* such extravagance as this, *one* would like to know a little more about it." To be sure; and before *he* does venture to *cite* it, I trust he will make himself better acquainted with its history than he was when he thus wrote; but it is somewhat presumptuous on his part, to imagine that they who *do cite* it, know as little of it as he does. "Mohnike's work," he says, "we have not seen." It is very clear that he has not, or he never would have written as he has done; and it would have been much better for his own credit if he had put himself in the way of seeing it; it would not have cost him any great trouble to procure a book which was printed in Germany about twenty-five years ago: and he would then have known something about the subject on which he was writing for the instruction of the public, and in the discharge of the important office which he has taken upon himself, that of "guarding the Church," as he calls it, "against the injury which is sure to arise from charges against Romanism or Jesuitism, which are

founded on a misapprehension of the meaning of authorities."

Perhaps, also, this guardian of the Church may see some reason to think that precautions are also necessary "against the injury which is sure to arise from charges against" his *brethren* which are founded not "on a misapprehension of authorities," but on a total ignorance of them. He has probably already repented of calling Ignatius of Loyola "so shrewd a man;" and perhaps, if he reads to the end of this Letter, he may be disposed for the future to speak differently of "the caution and discretion of the *Jesuits*," of which their doctrines concerning Equivocation, Obedience, Probability, Philosophical Sin, King-killing, and Mariolatry, and the Pope's Omnipotence, and their shameless assertions of false miracles, their open encouragement of Idolatry in China and Japan, and other points of Morals, Religion, and History, afford sufficient evidence, and to exercise a little more of those virtues in *his own* person. With this hope I heartily bid him farewell, and return to the Hungarian Confession. I shall first set it down in an English Translation*, and at the foot of the page I shall place parallel passages (which might easily be multiplied), from accredited Romanist Authors, to some of its articles; which will show, together with the other documents

* The original Latin will be found in the Preface to my Letters to M. Gondon, pp. vi—viii.

which I shall adduce in this Letter, that the propositions of this Confession, monstrous as they are, have been freely taught in the Church of Rome.

"*Roman Catholic Confession publicly prescribed and proposed to Protestants*" (on their admission to the Roman Catholic Church).

"I. We confess that we have been brought from heresy to the true saving Roman Catholic Faith, by the singular care of our Supreme Governors Spiritual and Temporal, and by the diligence and aid of our Masters the Fathers of the Order of Jesuits, and we desire to certify this by our mouths to the world at large.

"II. We confess that the Pope of Rome is Head of the Church, and cannot err*.

"III. We confess and are certain that the Pope of Rome is Vicar of Christ, and has plenary power of remitting and retaining the sins of all men according to his will; of thrusting them down to hell, and of excommunicating them †.

* Pontifex sive hæreticus esse possit sive non, non potest definire aliquid hæreticum. Bellarmin. de Pontif. iv. 2. Omnia jura habet Papa in scriniis pectoris, etiamsi idiota sit. Ludovic. Gomes. ap. Mohnike, p. 37, citing from Rango, who collected many of the parallel passages quoted in this Letter.

† Papa ipse solus confert plenam indulgentiam omnium peccatorum. Thom. de Aquin. Opusc. 21. cap. 10. Papa potest absolvere ab obligatione quâ quis tenetur. Eman. Sa. Aphorism. tit. Papa. Unicum nomen est in mundo Papæ videlicet. Greg. VII. ap. Cardinal. Baron. ad A.D. 1076. Papa a nemine judicari potest. Ibid.

"IV. We confess that whatever new thing the Pope ordains, whether in Scripture or not in Scripture, and whatever he commands, is divine and salvific; and therefore ought to be held by Lay-People in greater esteem than the precepts of the living God *.

"V. We confess that the most holy Pope ought to be honoured by all with divine honour, with the greater† genuflection, due to Christ Himself‡.

* See below, p. 209, the Silesian Confession, Art. I. Papa potest contra Apostolum dispensare. (ap. Mohn. p. 40.) 38. Distin. c. Lector. 87. Distin. c. Presbyter. Consensus Ecclesiæ multis partibus superat Scripturas. Francis Coster in Enchirid. i. p. 43.

† I have to thank the Dublin Reviewer for explaining this Roman Catholic term (see above, p. 183, note). My interpretation, against which he inveighs as ungrammatical and something worse, is supported in grammâr by Horace—"Cum de se loquitur non de majore reprensi?" and in sense by Art. XVII. of this Confession. With respect to the thing itself, see Crassus de Cœrimoniis Cardinalium, Epist. i. c. 22, who says that men must *flectere genu* at the name of the Virgin and of the Pope, as well as at that of Christ.—And in the Cæremoniale Romanum, lib. iii. p. 132, we read—"Quando Papa lavat manus,—antequam ad Pontificem perveniant, omnes *tertio genu terram tangunt*,—et auditores *genuflexi* hinc inde extremitatem mantilis retinent. . . Interim laici omnes circumstantes *genuflectunt*."—The Pope sitting on the Altar of St. Peter's is adored by the Cardinals. See my Letters, p. 299.

‡ Some of the following are among the parallels from accredited writers, collected by Rango ap. Mohnike, p. 42 :—Papa est Deus in terris; et quæ facit, facit ut Deus, non homo. "Dominus Deus noster Papa." Gloss. ad Cap. *Cum inter.* 4. verbo *Declaramus* De Verb. Sign. in Extrav. Joh. XXII. Papa potest de injustitiâ facere justitiam: Nemo potest dicere Papæ, Cur ita facis? Papa est causa causarum: dominus dominantium. See Bp. Barlow's works, Ferraris Biblioth. Prompt. v. Papa. art. ii. sect. 1—29, for abundant parallels to this Article; and Foulis's Roman Treasons, p. 27. Paulus V. VICE DEUS Pontificiæ OMNIPOTENTIÆ conservator acerrimus Caraffa

"VI. We confess and assert that the Pope, as our most holy Father, is to be obeyed in all things without any exception; and that such heretics as contravene his orders are not only to be burnt, but to be delivered, body and soul, to hell *.

"VII. We confess that the reading of Holy Scripture is the origin of heresy, and schism, and the source of blasphemy †.

"VIII. We confess that to invoke Saints, male and female, to honour their images, to kneel before them, to make pilgrimages to them, to light candles to them, is good, pious, holy, useful, and salutary.

"IX. We confess that every Priest is much greater than the Mother of God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, who once brought forth Christ, and once only; but a Priest of Rome not only when he wills, but whenever he wills, offers and creates Christ, and consumes Him when created ‡.

S. J., on an altar at Rome. See Bp. Bedell's Life, p. 11. 367, ed. Lond. 1692. See also my Letters, p. 303.

* See below, Art. XXII.

† Est Sacra Scriptura, ut in Concilio Wormatiensi dixerunt Jesuitæ, materia litis et officina hæreticorum. See Histor. Jesuit. Hasenmuller, 1595, p. 431. Scripturæ translatio est causa omnium hæresium. Alphons. a Castro iii. de puniend. hæret. Biblia est liber hæreticorum. Gerard. Busdrag. ap. Mohnike, 46.

‡ Sacerdotes, Creatores sui Creatoris, Stella Clericorum. Ap. Mohnike, p. 49. Regina Mundi Domina licet in gratiæ plenitudine creaturas supergrediatur universas hierarchis tamen Ecclesiæ cedit, in commissi ministerii executione. Illa enim prolatis octo verbulis, *Ecce ancilla Domini, &c. semel* concepit Dei Filium, isti autem *quinque* verbis eundem Dei Virginisque Filium advocant *quotidie* cor-

" X. We confess that to celebrate Masses, and to distribute alms, and to pray for the dead, is useful and salutary.

" XI. We confess that the Pope has power of changing Scripture, and of adding to it, and taking from it, according to his will *.

" XII. We confess that souls after death are purified in Purgatory, and that the Masses of Priests are useful to deliver them from it.

" XIII. We confess that to receive the Eucharist under one kind is good and salutary; and to receive it under both, is heretical and damnable †.

" XIV. We confess and assert that they who receive under one kind, receive the whole Christ with flesh and blood, with the Divinity and bones; and that they who receive under both, only enjoy and eat bare bread ‡.

" XV. We confess that there are seven true and real Sacraments.

" XVI. We confess that God is honoured in images, and through them is acknowledged by men.

poraliter in sacrificium. Qui creavit me sine me, creatur mediante me. Gabriel. Biel. Lect. 4. in Cantica.

* See above, Art. IV., and the passages of Pighius, Cusanus, &c. quoted above, in Letters IV. and V. Præsens Ecclesia librum Hermæ et Constitutiones apostolicas, &c. in Canonem Scripturæ referre potest. Stapleton, Relect. Princ. Fid. Controv. p. 514. Nullum Capitulum nullusque liber Canonicus habeatur sine Papæ auctoritate. Gregory VII. ap. Cardinal. Baron. ad A.D. 1076.

† See below, p. 209, the preamble to the Silesian Confession.

‡ See below, p. 209.

"XVII. We confess that Mary, the Blessed Virgin, is worthy of greater honour from men and angels than Christ Himself, the Son of God *.

"XVIII. We confess that the Blessed Virgin Mary is Queen of Heaven, and reigns together with her Son, and that her Son ought to act in all things according to her will *.

"XIX. We confess that the bones of the Saints have great virtue, and therefore ought to be honoured by men, and chapels ought to be built for them.

"XX. We confess that the Roman Doctrine is Catholic, pure, divine, saving, ancient, and true; and the Protestant false, erroneous, blasphemous, accursed, heretical, pernicious, seditious, commentitious, and fabulous. Since, therefore, entirely and fully, in all its developments, the Roman doctrine under one kind is good and salutary, therefore we curse all those who brought us up in the contrary

* See below, p. 209, Silesian Confession, Art. V. Eo ventum est, ut Christus etiam jam in cœlo regnans Matri subjiciatur. Cassander, Consult. Art. XXI. Maria est Regina Cœlorum, Domina angelorum. Sanct. Port. Mariale. Sola B. V. plus fecit Deo, . . unde Deus propter B. V. nobis obligatur plurimum. Oswald Pelbart. ap. Mohnike, p. 55. Maria jure materno quadam *super Christum regiâ* potestate gaudet. Salazar. in Prov. Salom. viii. c. 16. Ideo sic Ecclesia orat, *Monstra* Te esse *Matrem*, quasi dicat Virgini, Imperiosè supplica pro nobis Filio. Pelbartus, Stellar. 12. p. 1. Art. 3. c. 4. Tu Illius es Domina, et præcipe sublimiter; Mater superior est Filio, Matri debetur honor a Filio. Franc. Coster. in Hymn. Ave Maris Stella. Maria Complementum Trinitatis est. Pope Leo X. ap. Bembum. Epist. viii. 17. Pescheck, Geschichte, ii. p. 157, Es wurde einst in Steiermark gepredigt, der Maria werde einst Gott selbst noch unter-

impious heresy under both kinds. We pronounce our Parents* accursed who educated us in that heretical faith. We curse those also who excited in us any doubts concerning the Roman Catholic faith, and those also, who served us with that accursed cup. Yea, we curse ourselves, and pronounce ourselves accursed, because we partook in that heretical cup, which we ought not to have tasted.

"XXI. We confess that Holy Scripture is imperfect, and a dead letter till it is explained by the Supreme Pontiff, and allowed by him to be read by the Laity†.

than werden. See Acta. Hist. Eccl. xvii. 237. Mayer's Papist. Katechism. 10.

* In the persecutions of the thirty years' war, the Silesians, who fell away to Popery, were compelled to make a similar imprecation. See the contemporary historian, Fischard, Loci Communes Silesischer Gravaminum, Breslau, 1634, p. 186; quoted by Mohnike, p. 148:—"They who had never heard a mass were compelled to declare themselves Papists, and to curse their fathers and grandfathers, and to swear that they would believe all that the Church declared to them, whether it be in the Scriptures or no, and other like dreadful things;" on which Dr. Worbs (ibid. p. 149) observes, "These adjurations they were obliged to make in the churches, with closed doors. An awful scene! a whole congregation calling down curses, dictated by a Priest, on their own Parents!" See also, ibid. p. 152, concerning Michael Henning, who in "Revocationspredigt seine Lehrer und Eltern verflucht und verdamt,"—and Elsner's Verfolg. Gesch. 508; and Salig Geschichte, quoted by Pescheck, ii. p. 160, "They were compelled to curse their dead parents." See Appendix S.

† See the Romanist authorities in this Sequel above, pp. 85—100, and in Letters, pp. 121—124. 145—148.—Scriptura est mutila,—manca et imperfecta,—defectus ejus est sarciendus assumento Traditionum. Colonienses in Censura, p. 220. Scriptura est vox Dei quando Ecclesia per illam loquitur. Stapleton, Relect. 4. 9. 5.

"XXII. We confess that one Mass of a Roman Priest is more useful than a hundred and more Protestant Sermons *. Wherefore we curse those books which we have read, containing that heretical and blasphemous doctrine. We extend our curse to all our own works performed by us in heresy, that they may not bring any thing upon us in the last day in the Divine presence." All these things we do with a sincere heart, affirming that the Church of Rome, in these and like articles, is most true, with a solemn recantation of that other heretical doctrine, in Your hearing, honourable Men and Matrons, Young Men and Virgins, who are here present. We swear also that we will never return to the heresy *under both kinds* as long as we live, although it were allowed or shall be allowed to us to do so. We swear also, that as long as a drop of blood remains in our veins, we

Nomine Ecclesiæ ejus Caput intelligimus Pontificem Romanum. Gregor. de Valent. iii. Comm. Disp. 1. quæst. 1. p. 1. § 6. Si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quàm utilitatis oriri. Reg. 4. Indici Triden. præfixa. Non injuriâ arcetur populus a lectione Scripturæ: quid enim rudi vulgo cum Scripturâ? Gretser contrà Stenium. See also authorities from the Bull Unigenitus, cited in my Letters, p. 74.

* See the account in Hospinian, p. 71, of the Jesuit sermon at Ingolstadt, 1584, which contained these words:—"A true Catholic is not much pleased with Sermons, nor with reading the Bible, for it is a dead letter; but his only delight is in hearing Masses and in Confession. He who neglects these, sins more heinously, than the man who never heard a sermon, or saw a Bible." The Silesians were compelled to swear that they would "*flee* the CUP and the BIBLE." Pescheck, ii. p. 157. See below, Appendix S.

will persecute that accursed Protestant doctrine, by all means in our power, secretly and openly, by violence and stratagem, by word and deed, even with the sword *. Finally, we swear in the Divine presence, and in that of the angels, and of yourselves, that we will never depart from this saving and divine Roman Catholic Church, and never will return to the accursed Protestant heresy, nor embrace it."

Such, my dear Sir, is the Profession, which I affirmed, in my Letters to you, was prescribed and propounded to Protestants in Hungary and Germany, about the year 1673, on their reception into communion with Rome.

The Dublin Reviewer, having no evidence wherewith to disprove its authenticity, treats the "whole affair" as "*ridiculous.*" In which respect, he reminds me of what the Inquisitors are ordered to do, when any of their unhappy victims dares to quote Scripture. On all *other* occasions they are commanded to maintain a stern and imperturbable gravity; but, if any one should venture to cite the word of Inspiration, *then*, they are ordered *to laugh* †. So the Re-

* Comburendi sunt hæretici. Maldonatus in Comment. ad Luc. ix. 96. Gladio et igne extinguendi. Joh. Burgos in Act. Conc. Trid. p. 356. Lovan. 1567.

† Regulæ Inquisitoribus hæreticæ pravitatis v. et vi. Si hæreticus voluerit allegare Scripturas, tunc dicendum est ei cum *levi cachinno*, "Ah! dilecte domine, non est hic tempus litigandi et disputandi;" nec leviter debet ridere Inquisitor, nisi cum hæreticus Scripturam sanctam allegat.

viewer; he will not argue, but with the *levis cachinnus* of an Inquisitor he dismisses the whole affair as "ridiculous."

But it is not true here, that "solventur risu tabulæ; tu missus abibis:" facts are not to be laughed into fables; and if the Dublin Reviewer will allow me, I will first consider his objections to the Hungarian Confession, and then bring evidence to prove its genuineness.

First, he says that "one of my extracts from it, is evidence enough of its forgery;" and what is the extract he selects? It is this, "that they who communicate in both kinds, receive nothing but bare bread, which," says the Reviewer, "is simply an absurdity." Be it so; but it is simply such an absurdity as the Church of Rome herself inculcates.

It was argued by the Divines of Constance, that the Church of Rome is Mother and Mistress of the Faith, and that therefore obedience to her is necessary to salvation; and since she has decided that the Eucharist should be administered only in one kind (*sub unâ*), therefore to receive it in both (*sub utráque*) being an act of disobedience to her, is mortal sin*; and since all who persist in administering in both kinds are declared heretics and are excommunicated by her, therefore the Sacraments administered by them are of no effect, and they who

* See Von der Hardt, Concil. Const. iii. 698. 703.

receive the Eucharist from them in both kinds, receive *not* the body of Christ, but only bare bread.

Such is the absurdity of which the Reviewer speaks; it is the doctrine of Rome: and as such, has a proper place in this Confession.

But, further, we shall also shortly find that this very doctrine was actually introduced * into another Romish Confession of *undoubted genuineness*, I mean the *Silesian*, of which I shall soon say more.

He next objects to my assertion that the Hungarian Confession has found a place in the collection of "Symbolical Books," or dogmatic expositions of the Church of Rome; of which an edition was published a few years since by two Romanists, Streitwolf and Klener, and in which this Confession is printed; and where no doubts are expressed as to its genuineness.

"The Church of Rome," says the Reviewer, "has *no Symbolical Books*." Is this so? It is certain that she has published no definite collection of all her doctrines; she has, we know, an ever-growing series of Sibylline volumes locked up "*in scrinio pectoris Papæ*," "in the cabinet of the Pope's bosom;" but still I imagine she has *some* books, for example, Pius IVth's Creed, the Decrees of Trent, and the Trent Catechism, which have a Symbolical Value. Church Historians have taken this for granted. Naebe†

* See below, p. 209.

† Histor. Eccles. p. 465, ed. Lips. 1632. De Doctrinâ Ecclesiæ Romanæ secundum *Libros Symbolicos*. See also, ibid. p. 469.

writes a chapter "concerning the doctrines of Rome according to her Symbolical Books;" your own Divines also have been hitherto of opinion that you have such books; for example, many Roman Catholic Reviewers in Germany affirmed, when Streitwolf's work appeared, that an "edition of the Symbolical Books of the Catholic Church" had been much wanted *, and the learned Roman Catholic Theologian, Dr. Möhler, affirms, that the Decrees of Trent form a Symbolical Book †; and he himself has written a work, as you know, entitled, "*Symbolism*," for the express purpose of comparing the "Symbolical Books" of Protestants with those of the Church of Rome.

The Reviewer next affirms that Streitwolf, whom he does not deny to have been a Roman Catholic, had nothing to do with reprinting this Confession; and he questions whether Klener, his co-editor, was a Roman Catholic at all.

If he will read the Preface prefixed to their edition of the "Symbolical Books of the *Catholic* Church," as they call the Church of *Rome*, (a confirmation of the fact that they were members of that Church,) he will see that they engaged in the work as Roman Catholics; and that it is published by

* Klener, Prolegomena, p. xii. "Omnes, Catholici et Evangelici, verissimè monuerunt editionem Librorum Symbolicorum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ cùm maximè respondere ætatis nostræ votis."

† Möhler's Symbolism, i. p. 20, 21. Lond. 1843.

them as a Roman Catholic work. The very first page of the Preface, written by Klener, contains these words; "There is a great difference between the *Symbolical Books* of the *Catholic* Church and those of the Protestant. The former are resolved into the same divine authority as that to which Holy Scripture is ascribed; the latter we respect only as human witnesses of that form of Christianity which was constituted by the Reformers." If Klener, the writer of these words, hoped for a Reformation of the Roman Church, as the Reviewer asserts, and in that respect belonged to the "Church of the Future," he was not therefore a worse member of that Church, but a much better one.

Again: the Reviewer says that Streitwolf (who died a member of the Roman Communion in 1836), "had nothing to do with editing this Hungarian Confession." Now the fact is, that the design of the whole work (*viz.* the publication of the "Symbolical Books") was his; and the materials for it were collected by him; and a great part of the work, *viz.* the Trent Canons and nearly all the Trent Catechism, (as far as p. 588,) was already printed, when his labours were interrupted by his death *; and Klener, as he himself informs us, "followed in the footsteps of his friend, who had died a blessed death †," and continued and completed the work he had left un-

* See Klener's Preface, pp. xi. xii.

† P. xii. Vestigiis amici beatè defuncti ingressus.

finished. The "Hungarian Confession," it is true, is not in that part of the work which was printed in Streitwolf's lifetime; it did not belong to that portion of the Collection; but it had been in print more than a hundred and fifty years before Streitwolf began his work; and it had lately been reprinted by Mohnike, in Germany, with a learned dissertation upon it, and it is most probable that Streitwolf intended to insert it in his own sylloge, and left directions accordingly. This will appear almost certain, from the following words of the Preface, by Klener.

"In our second Appendix, will be found Five Confessions of Catholic Faith. We should regret that these were wanting to our Collection; but on account of their symbolical authority not being so great as that of the Creed of Pius IV., we have placed them in the Appendix."

One of these Five Confessions of Faith is the *Hungarian.*

The fact, therefore, remains uncontrovertible, that this "Hungarian Confession" has been printed in Germany, in the year 1838, in the Collection of Symbolical Books of the Church of Rome, edited by Streitwolf and Klener, who published that collection as Members of the Church of Rome; and that neither of them expressed the slightest doubts of the genuineness of the said Confession.

Let it not be said that they had not been led to

inquire into the history of the Confession; all the details of its origin were before their eyes in the two books to which Klener himself refers*, *viz.* Mohnike's "Authentic History of Roman Catholic Confessions," published at Greifswald in 1822, and the same writer's "Historical Account of the Hungarian Confession," printed in the following year†.

It is true, that Klener calls it "*sæva formula*," "a *savage* Confession,"—"a professione fidei Tridentinæ admodum aliena,"—"very different from the Confession of Trent;" but these words only prove that he *would* have got rid of it, if in honesty he could have done so; and that he felt himself *obliged*, in good faith, by the evidence of the case, to admit it, however reluctantly, into his Collection.

The question, you will remember, is not, whether this Confession is a *savage* one or not; a very savage one it certainly is; nor whether it is different from that of Pius IV.; nor whether it contains principles which the Dublin Reviewer abhors: but, whether it is a *genuine* work of Romish Teachers; whether it was imposed by them upon Protestants who fell away to the Church of Rome; whether, I say, it was publicly enforced by the most favoured ministers of the Papacy, and whether it was ever publicly condemned by the Church of Rome; whether it has

* Preface, pp. xlvii. li.

† My references in this letter are to *this latter* work.

not received the tacit sanction of that Church; and whether it is not a most striking exhibition of the fearful results to which her teaching leads?

These, I say, are the questions at issue; and if they are determined in the affirmative, then the abhorrence, which I do not doubt that many Roman Catholics feel, of some of the articles contained in this Confession, affords only another proof of the unhappy bondage to which they are subject; and of their own extraordinary folly and inconsistency, in submitting implicitly to the teaching of Rome, and in lauding her as possessing the attributes of Unity, Sanctity, and Infallibility.

Before I enter into the historical details of this Confession, I would observe, that from the beginning of the seventeenth century to that of the eighteenth, a war of religion was waged in Hungary*, Bohemia, Moravia, Saxony, and in other German states; and that the principal agents in this conflict on the side of Rome were the Jesuits.

The Fathers of this Order† were successful in perverting not only the lower and middle classes, but also in winning over many of the nobles and princes‡

* See Scepusii Historia Ecclesiæ Evangelicæ in Hungariâ. Halberstadt, 1830, pp. 33—37, and Appendix Q.

† Danz, Lehrbuch, &c. ii. 423. Jena, 1822. Die thätigste Unterstützung hierbei (*i. e.* in proselytizing) gewährten die *Jesuiten* mit eben so grosser *Arroganz* als *Unverschämtheit.*

‡ I may mention—
Frederick, Landgrave of Hesse 1636

of those countries to the Roman Catholic Faith. Ferdinand II., who was King of Hungary from 1619 to 1637, was educated by the Jesuits at Ingolstadt, and at the age of twenty had bound himself by a vow in the Church of Loretto to exterminate the Protestants, if he ever should come to the throne. He was chosen King mainly by the influence of Peter Pazmann, who had passed from the Helvetic Confession into the Order of Jesuits, and became Archbishop of Gran and a Cardinal, and who was indefatigable in his endeavours to compel Protestants to fall away to Rome. Ferdinand III. succeeded to the throne in 1637, and occupied it for nearly twenty years, and pursued the policy of his predecessor; but Leopold I., who followed, surpassed both the Ferdinands in persecuting zeal, in which he was instigated by Cardinal Leopold a Kolonitz, Bishop

Ernest, Landgrave of Hesse	1652
Christina, Queen of Sweden	1654
Christian Augustus, Count Palatine . . .	1665
John Frederick of Brunswick	1651
Christian, Duke of Mecklenburg	1662
Frederic Augustus II. of Saxony (in order to become King of Poland)	1697
His son, Frederick Augustus III.	1712
Maurice William, Grand Duke of Saxon Zeiz . .	1715
And his brother, Christian Augustus . . .	1695
Antony Ulric of Brunswick	1710
Charles Alexander of Wurtemberg . . .	1680

See Danz, Lehrbuch d. Kirch. Geschichte, ii. p. 423. Naebe's Eccles. Hist. p. 458. Mosheim mentions (Cent. XVII. § 16.) Wolfgang William, Count Palatine; and Christian William of Brandenburg.

of Neustad, and afterwards Archbishop of Gran. A conspiracy against the King was discovered in 1669; this was the signal for a violent assault on the Protestants: and this brings us to the period of the Confession.

The Confession, of which we are now speaking, was first published by George Lany*, Rector of the School at Karpffen, near Schemnitz, in Hungary, in the year 1676, in a Latin Narrative of his own sufferings for the cause of religion; and again by him, in a German translation of his Narrative in 1683. He mentions by name the person who was most active in imposing the Confession, Elias Gresner†, a Jesuit, who had been Pastor of Neusohl, a large town and bishop's see near Schemnitz, in Hungary, and had fallen away to Rome, and subscribed the Confession.

It was again printed in 1683, by Antony Reiser, a person of great learning and piety, as his extant

* Mohnike, pp. 2—17 compared with 211. 216.

† Mohnike, pp. 7, 8. 17. 35. At the close of the Confession are these words:—"Istorum perversorum præcipuus primipilus et antesignanus fuit ELIAS GRESNER, Pastor primarius civitatis Montano-Neo Soliensis, Impius Apostata et Seductor, cujus deus venter est." Mohnike cites (p. 8) a contemporary pamphlet, in the title of which Gresner is mentioned as follows:—"Admonition of the good Genius of Hungary to the miserable and impious ex-pastor, Elias Gresner, ex-pastor and wolf of the afflicted Church at Neusohl, in the year in which the *Jesuits* are tearing out the heart of Germany through the sides of Hungary, and yet bend the knee to Thee, O Holy Saviour!"

writings* show, and Lutheran Pastor of Presburg. He published the Confession in his account of the persecutions in Hungary in 1672†.

It was again printed by Conrad Rango, a very celebrated Theologian of Sweden, in his Suecia Orthodoxa, at Stettin, from the Royal Press in 1688. It was reprinted by the same writer in 1689, *Cum S. Reg. Majest. Sueciæ privilegio.*

In the year 1717‡, a Confession nearly corresponding with it, was printed at Mayence, a Roman Catholic city, and was publicly declared to have been the form of abjuration which was subscribed by Maurice William, Grand Duke of Saxon Zeiz in that year; and when his Protestant pastor, Dr. Jüngling, denied this fact in a printed work, the Grand Duke ordered Jüngling's book to be burnt. The history of this unfortunate Grand Duke is deeply interesting; he abjured Protestantism in 1717; again, abjured Romanism on October 16, 1718; and died on the 15th of November following.

Among his Reasons§, which he published, for abjuring Romanism, and which seem to have been suggested by the Confession, are the following:—

* *E. g.* his work against Atheism; his Anti-Barclaius; his work on the Theology of St. Augustine; these are written in Latin.

† Mohnike, pp. 6. 211, 212. 216.

‡ Walch. Bibl. Theol. ii. 150. Krug, Darstellung d. Unwesens d. Proselytenmacherei. Leipz. 1822. Mohnike, p. 85—87.

§ Mohnike, pp. 98, 99.

"*Motive* 2. Because in the Church of Rome *more honour* is given to the Pope than to Christ.

"*Motive* 3. Because the merits of Monks, Nuns, and Priests, and Masses, are preferred to the merits of Christ."

"*Motive* 9. Because *more honour* is there paid to the *Virgin Mary* than to Christ.

"*Motive* 10. Because his Jesuit Confessor, Schmeltzer, did not know how to refute Jüngling's arguments against the *Hungarian Confession.*"

These *Motives* of the Grand Duke are, I think, enough of themselves, to prove the genuineness of the Confession.

This same Confession was subscribed about the same period, by Samuel Haller, in Switzerland*.

But to return to Rango. The Confession had now attracted public attention in various countries in Europe; and some Roman Catholics began to feel shame, and to give vent to precisely the same sentiments as those now expressed by the Dublin Reviewer. They alleged that it was "a satirical composition of a Protestant," and instead of thinking that the Jesuits, and the Church of Rome, were in fault, they laid the blame on those whom Rome and the Jesuits had sought to exterminate by fire and sword, and on whom they enforced the Confession!

But Rango was not to be silenced thus. In his second work he writes: "You say that Lutherans

* Mohnike, pp. 21. 160.

have fabricated this Confession from hatred to Rome; but you ought to inquire whether your own teachers do not hold these doctrines, or whether others ascribe them to them falsely. This Hungarian Confession has now been more than ten years before the eyes of the world in print; and we are informed of the particular years, days, names of the persons persecuting and persecuted, the places whence they came, the form of abjuration used, word for word. We have the names before us of those who subscribed it; so that the man must have a forehead of brass who would pretend that the Confession is forged *. Besides, though the Confession has been so long published, no Roman Catholic, as far as I know, has *publicly* impugned its genuineness †, or written a word against it. This silence would certainly have been broken if the Confession were not genuine, and if the shame it has brought on the Church of Rome were not deserved. In ten years' time some Jesuit would certainly have arisen to disabuse Christendom of its error ‡."

* See the passage in Mohnike, Zur Geschichte des Ungarschen Fluchformulars. Greifswald, 1823, p. 16.

† Ibid. p. 17.

‡ It is true that a contemporary anonymous author writing against George Lany (see Mohnike, p. 4), said, referring to the Confession, "I should have recommended him not to have inserted such a questionable document" (tales res *incertas*—a very mild epithet for a forgery!); to whom Lany indignantly replied, "Cease from passionately doting on Rome! cease your personal animosity against me! Let it no longer tempt you to call in question a most patent fact, one attested by credible witnesses, and which is not contradicted even by

Thus, Sir, wrote Conrad Tiburtius Rango, a famous Swedish Divine, more than a hundred and fifty years ago. The silence, of which he speaks, remained still unbroken, notwithstanding his challenge; and it has so remained till our own age.

In our own times the subject has again engaged attention. In the year 1821, the Confession was published in the Academic Easter Programme of the University of Kœnigsberg, by Dr. Wald, Consistorial-Councillor and Professor of that University *; this Programme was printed at the University Press, with the sanction of the Pro-Rector, Chancellor, and others of the Academic body †.

The partizans of Rome were now obliged to speak. At a National Roman Catholic Church Synod of Hungary, in September 1822, the following Question was put by one of the Secretaries, Dr. Lang, a Canon of Gran, "Is it your pleasure to declare that the Creed of Pope Pius IV. is the *only* Confession to be required of those who return to the Church of Rome; and, moreover, that the Confession which is now circulated in Germany, and was printed in 1821

the Jesuits themselves. They who know of the shamelessness of the Jesuits in imposing Confessions by force upon our co-religionists in Bohemia, Moravia, and other provinces, you yourselves being witness, cannot call in question this Confession. Prove the contrary, if you do not believe me." We hear no more of the anonymous writer.

* Mohnike, Zur Geschichte, &c. pp. 157. 196. 199. 203. 233.

† Ibid. p. 203. 233.

in the Kœnigsberg Academic Programme, is *false* and calumnious * ?"

To which, the reply of the Synod was, "*Aye*," Placet.

Such was the answer of the Synod. It must be allowed to be a very laconic one; much more, and of a very different kind, would, I think, have been said by its members, if they had been able to show that the Hungarian Confession is a Protestant forgery; or if they had been willing that the subject should receive a searching enquiry †.

But it must not be forgotten, that a Priest of the Hungarian Church, Dr. Alexius Jordanszky, undertook in the same year to encounter the Easter Programme of the Prussian University ‡.

His plea is that no other formula was ever used

* Mohnike, p. 158, "*falsam* et *calumniosam*."

† The Decree said by Jordanszky (in his Dedication to the work mentioned in the following note,) to have been made by the Synod on this subject is longer, but not at all more circumstantial. See Mohnike, p. 202. It affirms that the Creed of Pius IV. was always used every where (*semper et ubique*) as the form of abjuration for converts into the Church of Rome; and that *no other* form was ever used for this purpose in Hungary—except occasionally a shorter one (nullam aliam *nisi fortè*, pro *re natâ*, contractiorem); i. e. *some* other than that of Pius *was* sometimes used. Five other Romish Confessions are published by Klener. See above, p. 198, and below, p. 211.

‡ In his work, "De Hæresi abjurandâ quid statuat Ecclesia Catholica? adversus Paschale anni 1821 Academiæ Regiomontanæ in Prussiâ Programma disquiritur, et Sacræ Synodo Nationali Posoniensi humili devotione substernitur ab Alexio Jordanszky Abbate, Strigonii (Gran.) 1822."

for purposes of abjuration in Hungary, but the Creed of Pius IV.* He is a zealous admirer of the Jesuits, whom he believes to have been ministers raised up by Heaven to counteract the heresies of Luther†; he was not acquainted with Rango's works, which contain the Confession; but he alleges that the Confession was fabricated by Lany, or Reiser‡, or some other Protestant, in support of which conjecture he does not bring any proof.

Such, Sir, is a brief outline of the evidence on this subject. The Roman Catholic Editors, Streitwolf and Klener, from whose work I copied the Confession, had all these facts before them; and accordingly "the Hungarian Confession took its place among the Symbolical Books of the Church of Rome," in their Collection.

But this is not all: my purpose in this Sequel to my Letters has been not only to substantiate my former assertions, but to add *new* materials in support of the propositions which they were intended to prove.

Some, perhaps, may have supposed, that the *Hungarian Confession* is the *first* and only formula of its kind: but this is not the case§. It was preceded

* See his Dedication.

† Page 96. ‡ Page 140.

§ As Pescheck says, History of Anti-reformation in Bohemia, ii. 156, "We find traces of these confessions in very numerous and very different places." See below, Appendix S.

half a century by the *Silesian* Confession: of which the following is a Translation*.

"*Confession and Oath, required to be subscribed by the Citizens of Glogau† and Grunberg.*

"I, miserable sinner, acknowledge to you, Father, in the place of God and the Blessed Virgin, and all Saints, that I, so long and so many years (according as the time may be), have held the accursed damnable heresy which is called Lutheran, and have been guilty of the execrable error of even going to their detestable Sacrament, where I received *nothing* but baked bread, and bad wine in a vessel‡. Such fearful error and damnable doctrine I renounce and reject, and never more will receive. So help me God and His Saints.

"Articles to which the Lutherans must swear:—

"1. We believe all that the Catholic Church enjoins, whether it be in Scripture or not.

"2. We believe in the Intercession and Invocation of Saints.

"3. We believe in Purgatory.

"4. We believe Seven Sacraments.

"5. We believe that the *Virgin Mary* is worthy of *greater* honour than the *Son of God.*

* See the original in the Appendix R.

† Next to Breslau, Glogau is the most populous town in Silesia.

‡ See above, p. 189 and 195.

"6. We profess that the Lutheran Doctrine is false.

"7. That we will never more receive the cup.

"8. Through the Intercession of the Saints, we accursed Lutherans have been brought to the knowledge of the Christian Catholic Church."

Such, Sir, is the Silesian Confession, whose genuineness is proved by public documents * now extant in Silesia; and certified by credible living witnesses †.

It appears, then, that a form similar to the Hungarian Confession, I mean the Silesian, was employed fifty years before the Hungarian; and that the Hungarian, with slight modifications, was used in various parts of Germany, from time to time, during half a century.

* In the Public Records of the Acts of the Evangelical Church of Glogau during the thirty years' war. See Appendix R.

† See Mohnike, Zur Geschichte, 140—155, who says, p. 141: "No doubt can be entertained that the first public source from which the Hungarian Confession is derived is fifty years older than that Confession." See again, ibid. p. 154: "The substance of the Confession dates from the beginning of the thirty years' war, and was employed in the persecutions of the Silesian Church." See also in this volume, Appendix S., and Ilgen's two works, Kirchenzeitung, 1833, and Hist. Theol. Zeitschrift, Leipzig, 1841, Heft 3; and Salig's Geschichte der Augsburgischen Confession, pp. 895—897. It was in these persecutions that Count Dohna, the principal agent in forcing Popery upon the Silesians with the sword, profanely said, "The apostle Peter is not to be compared with me; he converted only 3000 souls by a sermon, I have converted many more in one day without any sermon at all."

This fact at once refutes the plea that *no other* Confession than that of Pius IV.* was ever exacted in Hungary from those who were admitted into the Church of Rome. This is the main ground on which the Hungarian Synod of 1821, and Dr. Jordanszky, in his Essay of 1822, dispute the genuineness of the Hungarian Confession: and this is clearly untenable.

Let me now observe, that in this Silesian Confession we see that very doctrine which the Dublin Reviewer selected from the Hungarian Confession, as "simply an absurdity," and as a proof of its being a forgery †! Nor is this all: the Reviewer asks ‡—

> Did Dr. Wordsworth leave out from the extracts which he gave in his Letters from the Hungarian Confession the 17th clause, because it was overlooked? It is this, "We confess that the Blessed Virgin Mary is worthy of greater honour from Angels and Men than Christ Himself the Son of God?" or would the insertion of this clause make the forgery *too transparent* even in Exeter Hall?

Such is the Reviewer's question. This very clause also is in the Silesian Confession §.

If the Reviewer is not satisfied with the proof

* The Synod indeed says this with some reservation, "nullam, *nisi forte* pro re natâ contractiorem." But, as Pescheck (Geschichte der Gegen-Reformation in Böhmen, vol. ii. p. 155,) observes, the "plenary power given to the Proselytizers to *enlarge* the Tridentine Creed, '*sic* et *sic*,' pro re natâ, proves clearly that the assertion of the Synod is not correct." See above, p. 207, note.

† See above, p. 209, and p. 194. ‡ See above, p. 183, note.

§ Clause 5, above, p. 209.

now brought of the genuineness of the *Hungarian Confession*, I promise to adduce more evidence concerning this and the Silesian and other similar Romish formulas.

Let me offer a few comments on this subject, and I will draw this Letter to a close.

The first thing on which I would remark, is the fearful character of the propositions contained in this Confession. Men and Women, Nobles and Citizens, were brought either by persuasion or force, to pronounce a declaration in which they cursed their parents, and dishonoured the Name of God and of Christ.

In the meantime, the Church of Rome showered favours on those who were the principal agents in imposing this Confession—the Jesuits.

This, then, is clear, that there is no proposition too monstrous in morals or religion which the Church of Rome has not approved or may not approve, either openly or by connivance, whenever she sees a prospect of aggrandizement to herself from such a course.

It is certain therefore that they, who have evidence to this effect before them, are putting in peril their souls by committing themselves to her guidance; and that they who assist her, either by sanction or encouragement, are in danger of being called to account for her sins, and for the miseries of which they are the cause.

You will not suppose, my dear Sir, that I impute to you all the tenets contained in this Confession. Far from it. From some of them I am persuaded you recoil with abhorrence. But you will permit me to observe that, on the principles of Romanism, you have no good reason for doing so. For on what ground, let me ask, do you shudder at some of these propositions? Is it because they are contrary to *Reason*? But you must submit your Reason to the teaching of your Church. Is it, again, because they contradict *Scripture*? But, according to her, the Pope is the only Interpreter of Scripture, and may impose articles of Faith, not contained in Scripture. Is it because they are inconsistent with the faith of the Church of Rome? But the Pope is the only Judge in matters of Faith. The present Creed of the Church of Rome—imposed by her as necessary to Salvation*—is due to a Pope, Pius IV., and Popes may add new decrees to those which Popes have made. Is it, then, because these dogmas were not propounded by a Pope? But they *were* promulgated by the Pope's most devoted and honoured Ministers. They were imposed, in various places, at different times, and on most solemn occasions—the receptions of converts into the Romish Church. And yet, though the name of the Church of Rome was thus publicly employed, and identified with these articles, yet Rome never interfered to punish this use of her

* See below, p. 214, note.

name, though she exercised an inquisitorial censorship over theological writings with such rigour, that she proscribed Chrysostom and Augustine, Ambrose and Athanasius, and the Holy Scriptures themselves.

Allow me therefore to repeat, that it is not in *your power*, *consistently* with *Romanist principles*, to *abhor* these propositions. If you revere Rome, you cannot execrate them. They are to be regarded as a part of her teaching, and as a consequence of it. Nay, my dear Sir, the power which you have of abhorring these propositions is due not to Rome, but to the Reformation, which, under God, has saved you, and Rome herself, and the world at large, from being utterly enslaved by these monstrous doctrines.

But, if you do really abhor them, as doubtless you do, and as, if you exercise your Reason, and reverence Scripture and the Catholic Church, you must do, then you cannot any longer place implicit confidence in the Church of Rome: you must feel doubts in your own mind, whether she is an infallible, whether she is a safe, whether she is *not* a *most dangerous* Guide. You will then proceed to examine her *other* doctrines. You will be led to inquire whether there are not in her *authorized Creed* * of

* The Creed of Pope Pius IV., in which it is said—"Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extrà quam nemo salvus esse potest." It is printed in the Collections of the Decrees of Trent. See Streitwolf, i. 98, and Proleg. xlvii. [After

Pope Pius IV., which she publicly *imposes* on men as *necessary to salvation*, certain articles, which, as a Christian man, you *ought* to abhor not a whit less than these monstrous propositions of the Hungarian Confession. Be assured of this, that the Creed of Pope Pius *would* be abhorred by you no less than the other, if it were now presented to you for the first time, and if you were following the Guides which Almighty God has given you for your safe passage to Heaven,—Reason, Scripture, and the Church. And if *both* Creeds, that of Pope Pius, and the Hungarian, were (with reverence be it spoken) put together into the hands of an *Apostle*, it cannot, I think, be doubted, that *he* would abhor the former no less than the latter; nay, he would, in one

After a recital of the Nicene Creed, it enounces the following propositions :—

1. A firm belief in, and reception of, all Ecclesiastical Traditions and Constitutions.
2. Reception of Scripture according to the interpretation of the Church of Rome, who is called the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.
3. Roman Doctrine of Seven Sacraments.
4. Doctrine of Trent concerning Original Sin and Justification.
5. Sacrifice of the Mass for the Dead as well as the Living.
6. Transubstantiation.
7. Communion in one kind.
8. Purgatory.
10. Worship and Invocation of Saints.
11. Worship of Images.
12. Indulgences.
13. Pope's Supremacy.
14. Reception of Roman Canons, and of all the Decrees of Trent and all General Councils; and anathema of all contrary doctrines.

respect, pronounce that of Pius to be the more execrable of the two, as being the *origin* of the other, and containing in itself all the false principles from which the Hungarian and other similar Confessions have flowed, as from their natural source. Be assured also, my dear friend, of this, that by familiarity with the Hungarian Confession, your abhorrence of it would soon *abate*, and at length *cease*. Do you not see its principles *carried out* in practice before your eyes—especially with respect to the worship of the Virgin Mary—even in your own country at this day? and your Bishops and Clergy do *not* abhor—but they cherish and encourage that very thing, *in act*, at which, perhaps, when propounded in this Confession, they might at first be startled *in word*. Let therefore the *abhorrence* which you now feel be used, while it is still fresh, as an occasion for inquiry. Then good may be elicited from evil. Then even the monstrous propositions of the Hungarian Confession may be converted, by God's grace, into means for advancing His truth, and for the salvation of your soul.

I am, my dear Sir,

With much truth and affection,

Yours, &c.

LETTER X.

We abominate the impious imposture of those who have translated the most holy and humble Virgin into an idol of pride and vanity, and represented her as a vain-glorious and aspiring creature, thirsting after divine worship and honour. What greater affront than this could they have offered to her humility and sanctity? How fulsome, yea, how perfectly loathsome to us are the tales of those who have had the assurance to tell us of the amorous addresses of the blessed Virgin to certain persons, her devout worshippers . . . insomuch, that wise men have thought that the authors of these romances in religion were no better than the tools and instruments of Satan, used by him to expose the Christian religion, and thereby to introduce Atheism. In a word, such is the worship given to the Blessed Virgin by many in the Church of Rome, that they deserve to be called *Mariani* rather than *Christians*.—Bishop Bull, Serm. iv.

In Regno hoc Hungariæ, propter vetustissimam constantemque Deiparæ venerationem, *Mariani* Regni epitheton promerito, pia quondam extitit æmulatio inter Jesuitas, Dominicanos, etc. aliosque de clero et populo quisnam eorum coleret Mariam ardentioribus officiis verbis et scriptis.—Abbé Jordanszky, p. 127, of the work cited above, p. 207.

My dear Sir,

Such is the language of the Apologist of the Hungarian Church, Abbé Jordanszky, which

verifies in a remarkable manner the assertion of our Anglican Prelate, Bishop Bull, and may serve to connect my present Letter with the preceding. The Dublin Reviewer, in the remark which now demands my attention, proceeds to quote from my Letters. I had said in page 147, "It is the practice of the Church of Rome to celebrate the festival of the immaculate conception of the Virgin, and therefore original sin is no longer, in her case at least, an article of faith, but the contrary."

Now, (asks the Reviewer,) what can such a sentence as this mean? does our belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin-Mother interfere with the doctrine of original sin? If it does not—and who will say that it does?—such writing as this can have no other issue but the stirring up of the spirit of reviling and blasphemy. It might as well be said, that our belief in the removal of Enoch denies the fact that we must all die. It is almost despairing to see such a work as this arrive at a second edition, and to hear of its being recommended by estimable and amiable people. Surely, if the Anglican communion be in the right, it has no reason for calumniating. If it must be defended, why should it have recourse to untrue accusations against its enemies? If the Catholic Church be a lie, let those who think so abstain from lies themselves.

Permit me, in the first place, to cite here another passage from my Letters to you; as it bears directly upon this subject:—

"You remember that it was debated with great warmth at the Council of Trent, between the Franciscans and Dominicans *, whether the Blessed Virgin Mary was free from that 'fault and corruption of *every man* that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam †;' and though that Council, as you affirm, was divinely inspired, and though you have an infallible living Judge, and though the great use of Infallibility (one would think) is *to settle litigated questions*, yet the inspired Council and the infallible Judge have permitted the matter to remain unsettled even to this day ‡.

"The struggle at Trent concerning this doctrine was a very significant exposure of the inward conflict by which Rome was even then torn between Tradition and Development. Girolamo Lombardello, one of the Franciscans who contended against the Dominicans for the original sinlessness of the

* See Sarpi's History on the year 1546, pp. 164—171, in Brent's Version, and p. 186 of the Italian original, ed. 1629.

† XXXIX Articles. Art. IX. See also Art. XV.

‡ This is allowed by the Dublin Reviewer for Jan. 1847, p. 331. "It is well known that St. Thomas (Aquinas) did not hold the immaculate Conception, which is a pretty plain proof that it was not a commonly received doctrine in any age before his time. . . . *Up to this* time it has not been *definitely decided* by the Church that our Lady was without original sin, although there are several devotions sanctioned by the Holy See (which have indulgences attached to them) in which it is stated most explicitly." Here is another example of the adoption of the principle of Development by Romish writers, and a plain avowal that, in their opinion, the Church of Rome (i. e. the Pope) may *make* articles, *de fide*, in the nineteenth century, which have never been believed in any of the eighteen preceding ones.

Virgin, asserted that * 'the authority of the *present* Church was not less than that of the *primitive;* and if the consent of the ancient Church led men to speak of Original Sin, without any exception in favour of the Virgin †, yet the consent of the *present* Church, which proves itself by its *practice* in celebrating every where a Festival in honour of her Immaculate Conception, ought to induce us not to abandon it.'

"The expedient resorted to by the Council to reconcile the two parties would be an amusing exhibition of ingenious sleight-of-hand, if the matter on which this juggler's trick was played were not of the most solemn importance.

"The Synod, desiring to satisfy both sides, at first purposed to decree, that it did not either include or except the Virgin; that is, it wished to say—that it could say nothing. But this did not suit the Franciscans: so it said that it did not intend to include the Virgin; and it added, that the Constitution of Sixtus IV., who condemned all those who took upon them to assert that the doctrine

* Sarpi, Istoria, p. 188, Italian edition, 1629.

† Yes; and not only so, but it expressly taught that the Virgin *ought not* to be excepted. Thus S. Augustine, in Psalm xxxiv. Maria ex Adam mortua propter peccatum; and contra Julian. Pelagian. c. v. 15. Mariæ corpus ex concupiscentiâ venit; and Opus Imperf. contra Julian. vi. 22. Maria de carnali parentum concupiscentiâ nata. The assertion that the Virgin was sinless is due to a heretic, *Pelagius*, apud Aug. de Naturâ et Gratiâ, c. 36.

of the Immaculate Conception is heretical, when the *question had not yet been decided* by the *Roman Church* *, should be observed. So instead of saying either yea or nay, it ended with saying neither one nor the other †.

"But to return. We of the Church of England, following the early Church ‡, affirm that the doctrine of Original Sin, unqualified by any exceptions, has been developed for more than three thousand years. We find it in HOLY SCRIPTURE. 'The Scripture hath concluded *all* under sin §.' 'There is none righteous, no, *not one*.' 'In many things we offend *all*.' Adam lost his purity by sin. We all come from Adam. 'And who can bring a clean thing from an unclean? Not one,' said Job ‖, fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ. We all sinned in Adam: and by nature we are all tainted

* Bull, Grave nimis, A.D. 1483, in Jus Canon. Extrav. Comm. ii. tit. xii. cap. 2. "Quum *nondum* sit a Romanâ Ecclesiâ et apostolicâ sede *decisum*."

† The following is the Decree (Sess. v. de peccato originali):— "Declarat hæc sancta synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam, Dei genetricem, *sed* observandas esse constitutiones felicis recordationis Xysti Papæ Quarti, sub pœnis in eis constitutionibus contentis."

‡ e. g. Concil. Carthag. sub Cypriano, A.D. 253. "Infans recens natus . . carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiqua prima nativitate contraxit." Routh, R. S. iii. pp. 76. 121; whose note affords a complete refutation to the assertion, that "the doctrine of original sin can allege little definite testimony before the fifth century."

§ Gal. iii. 22. Rom. iii. 9. James iii. 2. ‖ Job xiv. 4.

and in a state of death through his sin *; this is the doctrine of the Apostles of Christ

"The mystery of Christ's Incarnation through the operation of the Holy Spirit, the Author of all Purity, is a proof of the corruption of human nature. It was necessary that the Son of God should take our nature upon Him in order to *suffer* for it; therefore He was born of a woman; but it was necessary also that He should be exempt from the *sinfulness* of our nature, in order to *satisfy* for it: therefore, as man, He was not begotten by man, but 'the Holy Thing which was conceived' in the womb † of the Virgin, and born of her, was of the Holy Ghost‡; was the Son of God. But *if* it were *possible* that a man born of a woman in the ordinary course of nature could be free from sin, then there was no *dignus vindice nodus* for the intervention of the Holy Ghost.

"Nor was it in any way due to the Blessed Virgin, that Christ was free from sin in His *human* nature; 'when He took upon Him to deliver man, He did *not abhor* the Virgin's Womb,' but the Holy Ghost

* Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Eph. ii. 3.

† Matt. i. 20. Luke i. 35.

‡ "Maria quidem mater Ejus," (says Augustine, Opus Imperf. c. Julian. vi. 22,) "de quâ carnem sumpsit, de carnali concupiscentiâ parentum nata est; non autem Christum sic ipsa concepit. quem non de virili semine sed de Spiritu Sancto procreavit." The assertion of the Virgin's sinlessness would undermine the doctrine that Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost.

was the cause, the only cause, that as man He was sinless."

Thus, Sir, I wrote in my letters to you.

Let me now turn to the Dublin Reviewer. He asks—

"Does our belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother interfere with the doctrine of Original Sin? If it does not—and who will say that it does?—such writing as this can have no other issue but the stirring up of the spirit of reviling and blasphemy. It might as well be said that our belief in the removal of Enoch denies the fact that we must all die.

I would gladly have been spared all discussion of this subject; but it is due to Truth, and (may we not add?) to the Blessed Virgin herself, who cannot be more *dishonoured*, than by disparagement of the Divine word, and by derogation from the Divine glory, to remind the Reviewer of the declaration of Scripture, "that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed on all men, for that all have sinned*;" and therefore we conclude, as a general rule, that *all men are mortal;* but it is also stated in Scripture†, as an *exception* to this rule, that Enoch did not die, but that "he pleased God and was translated;" and we believe that Enoch did not die, on the same authority as we believe that all men are under sentence of death;

* Rom. v. 12.
† Gen. v. 24. Heb. xi. 5.

and, if we had not the witness of that authority, we should not believe that Enoch was excepted from the general rule of mortality.

Now for the Reviewer's parallel. It is affirmed in Scripture, first, that all men are conceived and born in sin *; and, secondly, that no one is without sin, save our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ alone †: and yet, notwithstanding this Divine testimony of universal original sinfulness, and of Christ's unique sinlessness, the Reviewer dares to affirm that it might "as well be said that our belief in the removal of Enoch denies the fact that we must all die," as that a "belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mother interferes with the doctrine of Original Sin!"

If, my dear Sir, nothing had been said in Scripture concerning Enoch, as an exception of the general rule of human mortality, and *if*, at an interval of more than a thousand years after his death, a religious body, in defiance of the Word of God, had taken upon itself to deny that Enoch had died, and had ventured to celebrate an Octave in honour of his pretended exemption from death, and to address prayers to him, not only as free from the common laws of humanity, but as a partner in the

* Job xxv. 4; Ps. li. 5; Eph. ii. 3; John iii. 6, 7; Gal. iii. 22; Rom. iii. 10; James iii. 2.

† Matt. i. 20; Luke i. 35; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. iv. 15; vii. 26; 1 Pet. ii. 22; John viii. 46; xiv. 30.

incommunicable attributes of the Son of God, *then*, indeed, the world *would* have seen a parallel to the present Roman Festival of the Immaculate Conception,—and then only.

Leaving the Reviewer's expressions concerning calumnies and lies to refute themselves, I would beg leave to submit to him and to you the following questions:—

1. Do not the Divines of Rome confess—to quote the words of one of the most eminent among them—that all the Holy Fathers of the Church, for a thousand years after Christ, affirm with one voice that the Virgin Mary was conceived and born in sin *?

2. And yet, Is it not true, that at this day, a Festival in honour of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin is celebrated by the Romish Church; and that the doctrine that she was *not* conceived in sin, is made the *basis* of the Devotions of that Church for eight days, beginning on the 8th of December of every year†?

* Bishop Melchior Canus, Loci Communes, vii. cap. 1. p. 348, ed. Colon. 1605.—Sancti omnes qui in ejus mentionem incidere, uno ore asseverarunt beatam Virginem in peccato originali conceptam; to which opinion he says, "*nullus* sanctorum contravenerit." See also Suarez. in Thomam. Part 3. Qu. 27. Art. 1 & 2.

† A full account of the rise and progress of this festival will be found in the Abbé Migne's Theologiæ Cursus Completus, vol. xxvi. 647. 669. 671. In p. 670 we read, "Anno 1708 constitutione Clementis XI. sancitum est festum Conceptionis B. Virginis Immaculatæ ab omni Ecclesiâ de præcepto observandum."

3. Is it not therefore true, that a doctrine not only not contained in Scripture, but contrary to it, and not only not received by the Church for a thousand years after Christ, but contradicted by it, is now made the text of sermons and the theme of prayers in the Romish Church?

4. By thus propounding a doctrine which trenches upon our Lord's own attributes, does not the Church of Rome sin against Christ, and call upon others to do the same?

5. Again: by propounding a doctrine contrary to Scripture, does she not sin against the Holy Spirit, the Author of Scripture? and does she not call upon others to do the same?

6. Again: Our Blessed Lord, Who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," promised to be ever with His Church*, to send the Holy Spirit to teach her all things, and guide her into all truth †; and, therefore, does not the Church of Rome, by propounding a doctrine opposed to the teaching of the Church of Christ for a thousand years, not only do dishonour to the Church, but charge Christ Himself with a breach of promise, and the Holy Spirit with a want of either power or will to perform His Divine mission? and is she not thus also guilty of grievous sin against Both? and does she not oblige others to be guilty of the same sin?

* Matt. xxviii. 20.

† John xiv. 26; xvi. 23; 1 John ii. 20. 27.

7. Further; by employing the name and person of the Blessed Virgin Mary as the means of, and as a pretext for, robbing her Divine Son of His honour, and for breaking His Holy Word, is not the Church of Rome guilty of injury and irreverence to her who * said, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord," and "whatever He saith to you, do it;" and is not that Church guilty of acting as if she could succeed in making the Blessed Virgin—what the Tempter made Eve—an instrument and accomplice for rebellion against the Virgin's Creator and Lord, and for the destruction of the souls of her fellow-creatures?

8. And, lastly, can it, Sir, be otherwise than most perilous to follow the teaching and practice of the Church of Rome, which has been guilty of such heinous sins as these against the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, against the Christian Church, against the Blessed Virgin, and against all mankind?

I am, dear Sir,

Yours, &c. &c.

P.S. While this letter was going through the Press, my attention was arrested by the following document.

* Luke i. 38; John ii. 5.

In my first Letter * to you, I referred to the Lectures of Father Perrone, Professor of Divinity in the College of Jesuits, at Rome; one of the most celebrated Romish Theologians at this day.

The Professor has lately published at Rome a volume entitled, "*De Immaculato B. V. Mariæ Conceptu,*"—"On the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary;" which is dedicated to the present Pope, Pius IX.

In acknowledgment of this work, the Pope has written and published a letter to the author, in which he expresses his gratification in receiving a dissertation on this subject, and also his desire that the "worship and veneration of the Immaculate Virgin may be *everywhere more and more* increased day by day."

He then bestows an eulogy upon the Professor's abilities and erudition; and takes occasion to introduce a panegyric on the Society, called by him the "illustrious Order" of JESUITS, which, he asserts, "has produced so many men distinguished by their blameless life, and glorious sanctity, and by their zeal for the Catholic Religion, and by their services not only in Church affairs, but in those of State also †."

* Letters to M. Gondon, pp. 31—33.

† The *Univers* (18 Nov. 1847), speaking of this letter, says:—"C'est un nouveau témoignage d'affection donné par Sa Sainteté à l'illustre Compagnie, dont le P. Perrone est un des membres les plus distingués."

What the *civil principles* of the Society of Jesuits are, and what have been their results, has been already shown in the Third Letter of this Volume *; and in this Epistle of the Pope to Father Perrone, while we have a declaration in favour of one of the worst *religious* errors and corruptions of Rome, we have also a manifesto of the present Papal Policy, and an approval of Jesuit *politics*, under the hand of the Pontiff himself.

I subjoin a copy of the Letter in its original language.

"PIUS PP. IX.

"*Dilecte Fili, Religiose Vir, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.*

"Nihil certe nobis gratius, nihil optabilius, quam ut debitus erga Sanctissimam Dei Genetricem omniumque nostrum amantissimam Matrem *immaculatam* Virginem Mariam *cultus, pietas et observantia magis in dies ubique augeatur*, Ejusque laudum præconia ab omnibus rite concelebrentur. Ex quo profecto intelligis, Dilecte Fili, quanta animi Nostri voluptate acceperimus *Disquisitionem theologicam de Immaculato B. V. Mariæ conceptu* a te Latine exaratam, ac nuper Romanis typis in lucem editam, nobisque inscriptam. Equidem ubi primum gravissimæ atque multiplices supremi Nostri Pontificatus curæ et occupationes, quibus continenter distinemur, aliquid vacui temporis Nobis concesserint, haud omittemus Disquisitionem ipsam perlibenter degustare. Etenim minime ignoramus qua religione et pietate polleas, atque ex aliis tuis operibus jam vulgatis probe noscimus quibus egregiis ingenii dotibus et qua eruditione ac theologicarum præsertim disciplinarum doctrina et laude præstes. Quod quidem vel maxime decet illius inclytæ Societatis Alumnum, quæ tot viros vitæ integritate, sanctitatis gloria, Catholicæ Religionis zelo, omnigena sapientia insignes, ac de *Christiana et civili republica præclare meritos* habuisse lætatur. Dum autem tibi, Dilecte Fili, debitas

* Pages 52—62.

pro dono agimus gratias, te etiam atque etiam hortamur, ut majore usque alacritate tuas curas cogitationesque in iis potissimum conficiendis operibus impendere pergas, quæ rei tum sacræ tum litterariæ usui et ornamento esse possint. Denique præcipuæ Nostræ in te benevolentiæ pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem ex intimo corde depromptam, et cum omnis veræ felicitatis voto conjunctam tibi ipsi, Dilecte Fili Religiose Vir, amanter impertimur.

" Datum Romæ apud S. Mariam Majorem die 25 Octobris an. 1847.

" Pontificatus Nostri Anno Secundo.

" PIUS PP. IX."

LETTER XI.

The *Bishops of Rome*, by obtruding their own inventions both in faith and manners, and those inventions to be received under pain of damnation, became the *authors*, and still are the *continuers*, of the widest *schism* that ever was in the Church of Christ, from the first infancy thereof.—BISHOP SANDERSON.

MY DEAR SIR, —

What is the true nature of the position of English Roman Catholics, and of those who fall away from the Church of England to that of Rome, is a most important question, and one which does not appear to be generally so well understood, as not to require further elucidation.

The truths of Christianity, wherever they are received, cannot fail of producing beneficial results; and in the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the corruptions with which they are there overlaid, they have worked such good effects, as, in spite of human error and depravity, Divine grace is apt to bring forth. We should be magnifying the power of man against that of God, and we should be doing in-

justice to the Divine goodness, if we did not allow, with gratitude to the Almighty, that His gifts and graces have not been without their proper fruits of holiness and virtue in many persons in the Romish Communion.

But this effect of Divine goodness is often perverted into an occasion of error. There are some among us in England who allow themselves to be tempted to impatience by the frailties of some with whom they live; and who suffer themselves to be betrayed into an unthankful forgetfulness of the great and manifold blessings, which, as members of the Anglican Communion, they enjoy, in the possession of the Word of God pure and entire, of Sacraments unmutilated, and duly administered by persons lawfully called and sent for that purpose, and of a Church which builds her faith on Scripture alone rightly understood, and of a Liturgy sober without coldness, and devout without superstition.

The transition is very easy from ingratitude to irreverence: and the individuals, to whom I refer, are not unfrequently heard to speak in terms of disparagement of the Church of England, which bare them, nursed them, reared them, and taught them; and, since nothing is more offensive to Almighty God than undutifulness, it cannot be wondered at, if the grace of His Blessed Spirit should refuse to abide with those who vent words of reproach and despite against their spiritual mother;

and if—which is a necessary consequence of the withdrawal of His influence,—they should be given over to judicial blindness, according to the words of Scripture, "The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it *."

One of the most striking modes in which this mental blindness discovers itself is the following. Such persons as I am describing have no longer any eyes to see the fundamental errors of the Romish system; they will even overlook the tremendous fact, that she *imposes* on all who fall away to her, unscriptural and anti-scriptural terms of Communion, and compels them to imprecate a curse upon all who do not embrace these sinful terms.

At the same time they dwell fondly upon a circumstance, which is not due to any thing in the Church of *Rome*, as distinguished from the Church of England, but solely to *God's goodness and truth*, which do not fail of their effect even in the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the weight of human error and depravation with which they are there oppressed. The Church of Rome, Heaven be thanked, has never been without her Pascals and her Fénélons, as the Church of Judah in her worst days was not without her Nathanaels; and the persons of whom I have

* Prov. xxx. 17.

been speaking, being seduced into irritation by personal offences in the Church of England, or by real scandals in it, such as are incident more or less to every part of the Church on *earth*, and are designed to be the trials of our faith, patience, and charity, delineate to themselves portraits of ideal perfection in the Church of Rome, and then fall in love with their own "pleasant pictures *;" and being deprived, through irreverence, of that wisdom which is the partner of meekness, they fall into the snare which they have laid for their own feet; and believing themselves to be aspiring after holiness, they "change the truth of God into a lie," and violate "charity, which is the bond of perfectness †."

If it should please God to strive with them no longer,—if He should not think fit to address them by the voice of Conscience and of Reason from within, or by that of Scripture and His Church from without,—the probability is that they will go on in their unhappy course, imagining themselves to be on the point of attaining perfection, while they are bewildered by error, and fancying that they are in a state of peace, when they are in imminent peril of perdition.

In reference to *their* case on the one hand, and to that of *foreign* Romanists on the other, I wrote the following paragraphs, which have been censured

* Is. ii. 16. † Rom. i. 25; Col. iii. 14.

by the Dublin Reviewer at the conclusion of his article.

"It is my belief that our Blessed Lord designed His Church to be commensurate with the world in extent, and coexistent with it in duration. This Church,—thence called Catholic or Universal,—has many constituent elements, commonly termed *particular Churches*. Some of these are in a sounder state than others; some are in a healthy, some in a morbid, some in a moribund condition. Start not, I pray you, if I profess my conviction that the Church of *Rome* is of this *last* description; and that those national Churches, which communicate with *her* in *all* her doctrines, are necessarily in the same predicament.

"At the same time I readily allow that the corruptions of a Church are not in themselves sufficient to justify its members in *separating* from it. *Wilful* schism is a mortal sin. No *disease* can be imagined so great that this can be its *remedy*. No Church on *earth* is perfect: the Apostolic and Apocalyptic Churches were tainted with heresies. Tares there are, and ever will be, mixed with the wheat in every part of the universal field of the Church; and if the wheat will uproot itself because of the tares near it, it must look to grow, or rather to *wither*, in the *air*, for it will never find a place to its mind in the *soil*. Therefore do not suppose that I am calling on you or any one else to *pluck himself* up from that

part of the field in which he has been sown by the providence of God: No: let him only take care not to be *tares*, but to be *good wheat*.

"*But, then*, you must suffer me to add, that the case may occur of a Church not allowing any persons to communicate with her, *except* on this condition, that they communicate with her in her *corruptions*. A schism *must* then take place; and wilful schism, as was before said, is a mortal sin; and wo to him who gives *occasion* to it; wo to him, I say, 'by whom the offence cometh *.' It is clear that, in the case supposed, the whole guilt of the schism lies with that *Church* which *imposes sinful* terms of communion: and the party who does not communicate with her, does not *separate himself*, that is, is not guilty of schism. *He* is not the *injurer*, but the *injured:* he does not *commit* evil, but *suffer* it.

"Whether the Church of Rome *does* impose sinful terms of communion on her *lay* members I leave you to judge: that she *does* impose them on her *Clergy*, by compelling them to subscribe the Creed of Pius IV.,—which contains twelve articles not merely *unknown* to the Primitive Church, but, for the most part, *contrary* to what it received from Christ and His Apostles, and *destructive* of it,—with an express declaration that 'out of this faith' so enforced 'there is no salvation †,'—does not appear to

* Matt. xviii. 7. † See above, pp. 214, 215, *note*.

me to admit of a doubt; and that, whether any one *subscribes* this creed or not, the Church of Rome is guilty of schism by *obtruding* it, I for my part cannot hesitate to affirm. If the whole of her Priesthood were to abjure this oath as an illicit one, she herself would alone be responsible for what *she would call* their *apostasy.*

"But I am writing to a *layman;* and you will now understand from what I have said, that I make a broad distinction between yourself, born in France and baptized in the Church of Rome, and remaining in its communion, and those who have been baptized in the Church of England, and fall away from it. Let the Church of England be as defective as they allege she is in means of spirituality and holiness, let her even be as corrupt as *we* affirm the Church of Rome to be, still they cannot prove that she is not *a* Church, and that she is not *the* Church in which they themselves have been baptized; and unless they can clearly demonstrate that she has *excommunicated* them by *imposing on them sinful terms of communion,* as *we* can show that the Church of *Rome does* excommunicate all those who cannot receive the unscriptural and anti-scriptural additions she has made to the faith of the Apostles and of all the Apostolic Churches, they have severed themselves from the Church Catholic, and are guilty of the heinous sin of *schism.* They are aiders and abettors of those who set up Altar against Altar,

Priest against Priest, and Bishop against Bishop; that is, they are the promoters of 'confusion and every evil work *.' It is vain, therefore, for them to speak of their 'having *joined* the Church of *Rome*:' they have joined *no* Church, nor *can* they do so. They are *wilful* schismatics, and, as such, have put themselves out of communion with the *whole* Catholic Church. They are 'sine matre, sine sede, orbi fide, extorres sine lare †,' like Cain. Let them even then possess the knowledge of Apostles, and the faith of Martyrs, and the eloquence of Angels, yea, let them give all their goods to feed the poor, and their bodies to be burned, yet they have broken the bonds of Church unity, and therefore they have not charity; for, as St. Augustine says, 'non habent Dei caritatem, qui non diligunt Ecclesiæ unitatem ‡;' and therefore their gifts and graces, whatever they may be, profit them nothing §, but only serve to increase their condemnation."

Such, my dear Sir, are the sentiments which I expressed in my Letters to you, and which I still entertain, concerning the position of English Roman Catholics, and particularly of those persons who fall away from the Church of England to that of Rome.

The Dublin Reviewer charges me with inconsistency in writing thus.

Dr. Wordsworth (says he) believes the Pope to be Anti-

* James iii. 16.
† Tertullian, Præscr. Hæret. 42.
‡ c. Donat. iii. 21.
§ 1 Cor. xiii. 1—4.

christ (pp. 242. 300), and, consequently, the Catholic Church to be the body of Satan; and yet dare not be consistent enough to call on M. Gondon or any other foreigner to leave the communion, which, on his principles, must carry all its members to everlasting ruin. Anglican divines have opinions, and propound theories, but they have no grasp of truth: they shrink from their own conclusions as soon as they have uttered the premises, and make strong assertions, but they do not, cannot believe what they say.

Whether it is true that "I dare not be consistent enough to call upon you, my dear Sir, or on any foreigner, to *leave the Communion*" of the Church of Rome in which you have been born and bred, will be evident to all who will carefully consider what I have now cited from my Letters to you. It is scarcely necessary to point out to *reflecting readers* the fallacy lurking in the Reviewer's words, "*to leave* the Communion of Rome." To *leave* a Communion is a *voluntary* act of separation: *Voluntary* separation, it is quite true, is not recommended by me to you, or to any one; but one of the main purposes with which my Letters were written, was to warn all whom it may concern, against communicating with the Church of Rome in *any of her sins;* and, if this non-communion in sin should entail censure and excommunication upon the person refusing to be partaker of her sins, if, like the man in the Gospel who was born blind, and would not join with the Pharisees in denying Christ*, he

* John ix. 30—33.

should be put out of the Synagogue on account of his good confession, then let him be assured, that like him he will be found by Christ *, and be comforted by Him, Who has said to His disciples, "They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service†:" and all the sin of the separation will lie at the door of those who cast him out, and, in this case, he cannot be said to "*leave* the Communion of a Church," but *that* Church which acts thus, does, so far as these sins are concerned, *cut herself* off from the communion of Christ.

To what has been now said, I beg to add, that the more I reflect upon the matter, the more I see reason to dwell upon the *very great difference* between the case of foreigners born and bred in the Church of Rome, and, it may be, knowing nothing of any other form of Christianity than Popery, and that of those who, being born and bred in England, and baptized in the Church of England, fall away to that of Rome.

Some, I know, of the *latter*, are apt to administer false comfort to themselves, by imagining that, by seceding to Rome, they join the Church of a Fénélon or a Pascal, of an Anselm or a Bernard, to whom they ascribe such qualities as are dictated by their own desires of finding an apology for themselves, forgetting altogether that the better any man

* John ix. 35. † Ibid. xvi. 2.

is, the more he must abominate schism, and the more he must love the truth, wherever and whenever it can be proved to be such; and the more severely therefore must he reprobate that pride, which makes divisions in the Church, and abhor that heresy which rejects pure and ancient truth, and embraces doctrines which can be shown to have been unknown to the primitive Church, or condemned by it.

To pass from them to yourself, and those in your condition. *Voluntarily* to *leave* a Church, in which a man has been baptized, on the plea of the evil lives, or erroneous belief, or unsound teaching, of some of its members, is, as I have said, a great sin. Nothing is clearer than the teaching of Scripture and the Ancient Church on this subject. In Scripture language, there are good fish and bad fish in the net of the Church *; and the good cease to be good, if they break through the net because of the bad † who are with them in it.

Both must remain together till they are drawn to the shore, and *then* they will be *separated:* but they cannot hope to be drawn to the "land of everlasting life" if they do not remain in the net. This

* Matt. xiii. 47.

† St. Augustine, in Psal. xl.—"Tolerate the tares, if you are wheat; tolerate the chaff, if you are good grain; tolerate the bad fish within the net, if you are good. Why, before the time of the harvest, do you pluck up yourself? Why, before you come to the shore, do you burst the net?"

is what ought to be carefully considered by all who feel tempted to break away from the communion of the Church of England.

Let me remind you, that this *was* borne in mind by those who were raised up by Divine Providence to effect a Restoration of the true Religion in *this* country in the sixteenth century; this love of unity as well as of truth was that which characterized the *English* Reformation, and made it a model for all to follow who would endeavour to bring back a corrupt Church to primitive purity. This also it is, by which we rebut all charges of schism brought against us by the Church of Rome, which would, I fear, have been better pleased, if we had renounced ancient truth, as well as freed ourselves from her novel corruptions of it; and is justly chargeable with the schism of which she accuses us, because she makes communion in her corruptions essential to communion with herself.

But to return to our Reformers; If I may so speak, they did not break the net of the Church; they did not violate its unity by making any new Creeds, or instituting new Sacraments, or by setting up any new Altars; they retained the Holy Orders which they and their predecessors had received in an unbroken series from Christ and His Apostles; they cleared themselves from novel errors, and retained all ancient essential truths; and thus, by God's mercy acting through their means, the Church of

England was recovered in a peaceful and regular manner to her primitive purity of doctrine. Such were the conservative and restorative principles on which they acted; and no one can reasonably hope to meet with success in any attempt to bring back a corrupt Church to a sound state, who does not walk in the same path of charity and truth as that which was trodden by them.

Upon the whole, therefore, on the one hand, if I might address *English* Romanists, I would say to *them*,—You are guilty of the sin of schism, in voluntarily separating yourselves from the Communion of the Christian Church planted in this country; and, if the voice of Scripture be true, you are forfeiting the blessings promised to those who "dwell together in unity," and you are liable to the punishment threatened against those who create strife in the Church of Christ; and as you love your immortal souls, and as you desire everlasting happiness, you ought to desist from your unholy work of making divisions, and to join yourselves to the Church of England, and to endeavour to edify her by your Christian life and conversation. No other course, believe me, or rather let me say, believe the Word of God, is safe for you; and *if this* course be pursued by you, yours will be the unspeakable blessedness promised to those who are peacemakers, and are called "the children of God*."

* Matt. v. 9.

On the other hand, my dear Sir, if I may be permitted to speak to *foreign* Romanists in your own and other Roman Catholic countries, my language would be—Retain all the truth you possess. Preserve the Scriptures; preserve the Creeds; preserve the three Orders of Christian Ministers; preserve the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, the observance of the Lord's Day, of Fasts and Festivals. But while you *preserve* these things, *purify* them also. Purify the Scriptures from their alloy of Traditions with which they have been adulterated by the Church of Rome, and of the Apocryphal Books, received by her as canonical; purify them from false interpretations derived from degenerate practice; purify the Creeds from their Tridentine additions; rescue Episcopacy from Papal domination; let not the Decalogue be set aside by the commandments of men; let not the Hail Mary be any longer a rival to the Lord's Prayer; think not that the Lord's Day can be hallowed by pompous processions, and secular pageants; remember our Lord's warnings concerning Fasts; let Festivals be cleansed from all profane application to superstitious and idolatrous uses. "Thus if thou takest forth the precious from the vile," then, says the Almighty Himself by the Prophet, "thou shalt be as My mouth*."

* Jerem. xv. 19.

With such sentiments as these I wrote the following words, with which I conclude my reply, as far as this topic is concerned, to the Dublin Reviewer:

"You will pardon me, I trust, if I venture to say that *your* true wisdom, and your true charity to yourself and to your Church, would be not to confirm her in her errors by collecting examples and publishing catalogues of the apostasies which have taken place in England, but to examine the faith and practice of *your own* Church by the standard of Reason, Scripture, and primitive Antiquity; and having observed her miserable declensions from it, to endeavour to raise her to the position in which she once stood, and from which she has now most lamentably fallen. Oh! that you, and others of ability, knowledge, and zeal like you, would labour to bring *back* your Church to what she *was* in the days of your Hilary and of your Irènæus! What a noble exercise would this be of your piety and patriotism! You have had appeals from England, calling on you to pray for *our* Conversion; let now another voice, however feeble, of a different kind, excite you to labour and pray for *your own Reformation.*"

It only now remains for me to advert to the words of the Dublin Reviewer, in which he says, that I affirm "the Pope to be Antichrist, and the *Catholic* Church" (as *he* calls the Church of *Rome*) "to be the body of Satan:" and that by consequence it is

my belief that no member of that Church can be saved.

First, then, let me assure him, that I believe the *Catholic* or Universal Church to be the mystical body of *Christ;* for such is the doctrine of Christ Himself, speaking by His Apostles * in Holy Writ.

Next, let me remind him that I have never once spoken in my Letters of the Church of *Rome* in any other terms than as of "a *part*, and a very *corrupt* part of the *Catholic* Church †." And, in my judgment, it is no less preposterous to call the Church of *Rome* the *Catholic* Church, and to ascribe the attributes of the Catholic Church to *her*, than it would be to mistake a diseased organ for the system to which it belongs; and to imagine that all the functions of a body are contained in an ulcerated limb, which impairs the strength of the whole frame, and may perhaps require amputation, before the health of the body can be restored.

Thirdly, the Reviewer alleges that I affirm the "Pope to be Antichrist."

The word *Antichrist* signifies one who puts himself in *the place* of Christ, and in *opposition* to Him; and because the authority of Christ is resisted in this world in many different ways, it is said in the Word of God ‡ that "there are many Antichrists;" and the Christian Church has been taught by Holy

* 1 Cor. xii. 27; Eph. i. 23; iv. 4; Col. i. 24.
† Pp. 4. 30. 270. ‡ 1 John ii. 18.

Scripture, that, before the course of this world is brought to a close, some Apostate Power would arise, which, from its proud and impious deeds, would bear that awful name, "*The Antichrist.*"

It is not fitting for private persons to speak confidently of what *will be:* and I confine myself to what *has been,* and to what *is.*

In one of my Letters it is shown, that the Pope of Rome, at his first Inauguration, sits "in the Temple of God," upon the Altar of God, and is there worshipped as God *.

It is also shown that at his Coronation he requires himself to be styled "Ruler of the World †." Thus, on those solemn occasions, he sets himself *in the place* of Christ; and this is *one* attribute of Antichrist.

It is also proved that the Pope places himself in *opposition* to Christ in various ways; for instance, by affirming that certain Books ‡ are inspired by God, which were never received as such by Christ; and by imprecating curses, and by forcing others to imprecate them, on all who do not and cannot receive those Books as such; and by excommunicating all who administer the Holy Communion § in the manner in which it was instituted by Christ, and commanded by Him to be received ‖.

Thus the Pope sets himself *against* Christ, with

* Letter XII. p. 299. † Ibid. p. 305. ‡ Letter IV. p. 110.
§ Page 148. ‖ John vi. 53; Matt. xxvi. 28.

respect to the two great foundations of the Church, —the *Word*, and the *Sacraments*.

This is the *second* attribute of Antichrist.

It is further observed * in the same Volume, that the title, which St. Paul assigns to Antichrist, is 'the Lawless one †;" and that this title is remarkably applicable to the Pope, who defies, and would destroy, all Law, Human and Divine.

Again; it is very observable, that almost all the ancient Latin Poets, speaking, as it were, with one voice, and ranging over a period of five hundred years, have described *Rome* as the ‡ seven-hilled

* P. 38. 42. 243. † ὁ ἄνομος, 2 Thess. ii. 3—7.

‡ "Urbs septicollis."

The following passages concerning *Rome* will occur to the classical reader.

Virgil. Georg. ii. 535. Æn. vi. 784 :—
Septemque una sibi muro circumdedit *arces*.

Horace. Carmen Sæc. 7 :—
Dis, quibus *septem* placuere *colles*.

Tibullus. ii. v. 55 :—
Carpite nunc tauri de *septem montibus* herbas.

Propertius. iii. x. 57 :—
Septem urbs alta jugis toti quæ præsidet orbi.

Ovidius. Trist. i. iv. 69 :—
Sed quæ de *septem* totum circumspicit orbem
Montibus imperii *Roma* deûmque locus.

Silius Italicus. xii. 606:—
Defendere tecta
Dardana et in *septem* discurrere jusserat arces.
See also x. 587; xvi. 620.

Statius. Silv. iv. iii. 26 :—
Septem montibus admovere Baias.

Martial. iv. lxiv. 11 :—
Hinc *septem* dominos videre *montes*
Et totam licet æstimare Romam. [*Claudian.*

city, and thus seem to have identified it with the City on the Seven Mountains, in which, if Christian prophecy be true*, the Antichristian Power will appear.

Judging therefore from the past and from the present, I do not shrink from affirming, that the Roman Papacy has rendered it impossible to doubt, that in divers ways it *has* placed and *does* place itself in the room of Christ, and in opposition to Him; and *must* therefore, as far as these acts of usurpation are concerned, in Scripture language, be called *Antichristian* I say, "as far as these acts are concerned," because all the corruptions of Rome shall never provoke us to forget the goodness and long-suffering of God, in still permitting her to retain certain main articles of the *Christian* Faith, by virtue of which she is still a Church; in the same manner as the Congregation of Israel in the wilderness †, guilty as it then was of idolatry and rebel-

Claudian. xii. 19 (ed. Gesner) :—

Aurea *septem*geminas
Roma coronet *arces.*

See also xv. 194.

Prudentius. De Romano Martyre, 411 :—

Divûm favore cum puer Mavortius
Fundaret *arcem septicollem* Romulus.

Such are some of the expressions of Roman Poets concerning Rome. Is any *other* city in the world described in similar terms? No.—Let us now turn to the words of Inspiration: Rev. xvii. 9. "Here is the mind (or sense) which hath wisdom. The seven heads are *seven mountains* on which the woman sitteth."

* Rev. xvii. 9. † See Hooker, iii. 1—8.

lion, yet by reason of the Law of God and of His Priesthood, was still a *Church*, and is so called in Holy Writ*; and by means of these articles of Faith, it may charitably be hoped that such of the members of the Church of Rome as do not wittingly and wilfully communicate with her in her "gross and grievous abominations†," may, through the Divine favour in Christ Jesus, meet with mercy from God.

If I am in error in thus asserting, that, while in sundry most momentous respects Rome is Antichristian, yet the salvation of some in her communion is not impossible, this is an error which may plead in its behalf the authority of some of the wisest of Christendom‡, and which is commended by the voice of Love, which is no other than the Voice of God§.

Yes, Sir, and in conclusion, it is for no other reason, than because we are led by *that* voice, that we do most deeply deplore the disposition now ex-

* Acts vii. 38. † Hooker, iii. 1. 11.

‡ For example, Hooker. See Sermon ii. compared with Sermon v. 15, where he calls the Pope "the Man of Sin." So Bp. Andrewes acknowledges Rome to be a Church, and yet says (ad Cardinalem Bellarmin. cap. ix. p. 220) :—Ex secundo capite secundæ ad Thessalonicenses probabiliter colligitur Romanum Pontificem Antichristum esse. And the Church of England in her Articles and Canons (Art. XIX. and Canon XXX.) acknowledges Rome to be a Church, and yet, in the Preface to her Authorized Version of her Bible, the Pope is called "the Man of Sin."

§ 1 John ii. 16.

hibited by Rome, to develope the *Antichristian* elements of her system in their widest expansion, to the counteraction and neutralization, and, it may be, to the final and total extinction, of all that she still retains of *Christian* principles; and we look with doubt and dismay, no less for her own sake, than for that of the World, on the excessive arrogance and impiety with which she now enforces her errors and corruptions, and prosecutes her mad career of usurpation; and as years pass on, we see *more* and *more* reason to fear, lest she may manifestly *prove* by her acts, what her worst enemies have long believed to be true, that the Pope is indeed *that* Antichrist, "whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming *."

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours, &c. &c.

* 2 Thess. ii. 8.

LETTER XII.

Whoever will consider Popery as it is at Rome, may see that it is a manifest open usurpation of all divine and human authority
BISHOP BUTLER, Sermon before the House of Lords, 1747.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have now concluded my observations on the exceptions which have been made against my Letters to you by the several Critics mentioned in the first Letter of this Sequel; and having shown, as I conceive, that their remarks do not invalidate the argument of my Volume, but rather supply occasion for amplification and corroboration of it, I would now lay down my pen, if there were not one topic which seems to require notice, as furnishing a recent and most striking example of the "Destructive Character of the Church of Rome, both in Religion and Polity."

For the first twelve years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, as is well known, the Roman Catholics of this country came to our Churches; and they con-

formed to the worship of the Church of England, till the Bull of Pius V., which excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and pretended to dethrone her, was published *.

During that Queen's reign, there was no Roman Catholic *Bishop* in England.

In the year 1601, Mr. George Blackwell, a Romish Presbyter, was appointed by Pope Clement VIII. to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all the Roman Catholics of England, with the title of *Arch-Priest* †. Pope Gregory XV. (A.D. 1621—23) sent William Bishop to England, as Episcopal Delegate from the See of Rome; and on Bishop's death, in the year 1628, Richard Smith was sent into this country with the mere nominal title of Bishop of Chalcedon; but he, finding his stay dangerous, a Royal Proclamation having been issued with a reward of a hundred pounds for his apprehension, fled into France, where he was very favourably received by Cardinal Richelieu ‡.

To come now to our own times; we find that till recently the Romish Hierarchy in England consisted

* See the words of Sir Edward Coke, Attorney General, in the trial of the conspirators of the Gunpowder Plot. 2 Howell, State Trials, 178.

† See the Bull of the Pope, "Cum nobilissimum," dated Rome, 17 Aug. 1601. This bull was issued at the recommendation of Cardinal Caietanus, who was styled at Rome, "Protector of the English Nation." See also here above, p. 20.

‡ Dupin's Church History of the Seventeenth Century, Book ii. chap. viii. and Fuller's Church History, A. D. 1628.

of four *Vicars Apostolic*, with Episcopal titles derived from *foreign* cities *in partibus infidelium*.

On the 11th of May, 1840, the College of the Propaganda of Rome divided England and Wales into *eight* Vicariats; and such was the state of things up to the commencement of the year 1847.

We are now informed, that the Pope has instituted at Rome a special Congregation, entitled "*De rebus Britannicis*," to which he has entrusted the care of Romish ecclesiastical affairs in England.

We are also apprized, that he has erected the eight Anglo-Romish Vicariats into *Episcopal Dioceses*.

It is further stated, that he has assigned titles derived from ENGLISH CITIES to those whom he proposes to set over these Dioceses; as follows:—

London District, to become .	Archbishoprick of Westminster.
Western District . . .	Bishoprick of Plymouth.
Eastern District . . .	Bishoprick of Northampton.
Central District . . .	Bishoprick of Birmingham.
District of Lancashire . .	Bishoprick of Liverpool.
District of Wales . . .	Bishoprick of Newport.
District of Yorkshire . .	Bishoprick of Leeds.
Northern District . . .	Bishoprick of Newcastle.

Whether the Papal bulls purporting to establish these arrangements have arrived in this country or not, is a question which may command the attention of higher authorities in England than the Bishop of Rome; but I have to observe, that in this recent act of the Papacy, we have a most remarkable proof of the presumption with which it outrages all Law, Ecclesiastical and Civil.

To consider this subject *first* in its *ecclesiastical* bearings. What are the decrees of the Catholic Church, in its General Councils, concerning Episcopal jurisdiction?

According to them, there cannot be two Metropolitans in the same Province, nor two Bishops in the same Diocese.

These two propositions are clearly laid down by the Church in the *first four General Councils*, which are of such paramount authority, that any one, who will venture to set himself in wilful opposition to them, incurs the charge of *heresy* as well as of *schism*.

In the eighth Canon of the Council of Nice—the *first* general Council—a prohibition will be found to this effect,—that there may not be "*two Bishops in the same city.*" The second Canon of the *second* General Council, that of Constantinople, specially enjoins that "no Bishop shall *intrude* himself into a *Diocese* which does *not belong to him*, and thus introduce confusion into the Church;" and in the sixth Canon, it brands with the stigma of heresy those "who *separate themselves*, and set themselves up in opposition to *lawful Bishops.*" The *third* General Council, that of Ephesus, declares, that "no Bishop shall occupy, and exercise any function in, a province which does not appertain to him; and if he shall presume to do so, he shall make restitution." The *fourth* General Council, that of Chalcedon, in

the twelfth Canon, orders that there shall not be "*two Metropolitans* in *the same Province.*"

I might add other citations of a similar kind; as, for instance, from one of the earliest Councils, that of Antioch, in which it is enjoined (Canon v.), that if "any one shall set up a rival *altar* against *altar*, he shall be *deposed*, and never be restored to his former dignity;" and that "no Bishop (Canon XIII.) shall dare to *invade* the Diocese *of another*, and confer orders in the same, and that all orders so conferred shall be deemed invalid;" and (Canon XIX.) that "no Bishop shall be consecrated without the consent and presence of the Metropolitan."

Let the present act of the Pope be judged by these Laws of the Church, and it will then be seen what kind of deference he pays to her *authority*, and what regard he has for her *unity*. Certainly it must be affirmed, that, as far as this act is concerned, he does all in his power to destroy *both*.

Secondly, let us contemplate this matter in its *civil* character.

By the principles of the English Constitution, the *only* fountain of *honour*, the *sole* author of *titles*, in this country, is the CROWN.

Judge Blackstone thus writes on this subject:—

"The *king* is likewise the *fountain of honour*, of office, and of privilege; and this in a different sense from that wherein he is styled the fountain of

justice; for here he is really the parent of them. It is impossible that government can be maintained without a due subordination of rank; that the people may know and distinguish such as are set over them, in order to yield them their due respect and obedience; and also that the officers themselves, being encouraged by emulation and the hopes of superiority, may the better discharge their functions: and the law supposes that no one can be so good a judge of their several merits and services, as the king himself who employs them. It has therefore entrusted him with the *sole power* of *conferring dignities and honours*, in confidence that he will bestow them upon none but such as deserve them. And, therefore, *all* degrees of nobility, of knighthood, and *other titles*, are received by immediate grant from the *Crown*, either expressed in writing, by writs or letters patent, as in the creation of peers and baronets, or by corporeal investiture, as in the creation of a simple knight *."

Such is the fundamental principle of the British Constitution concerning titles of honour in this country.

According to this rule it is, that not even a *foreign* Order of Knighthood can be worn by an English subject, without leave from the Sovereign †.

* Blackstone's Commentaries, ed. Lond. 1809. Vol. i. p. 271. The Rights of Persons. Bk. i. chap. vii. sect. iv.

† See Manual of Rank of Nobility, p. 341, ed. London, 1828.

And, now, Sir, an Italian Bishop presumes to designate eight persons, British subjects, with titles, not taken from any *foreign* country, but from towns in the Queen of England's own dominions!

Thus he calls upon these eight persons to join with him in an act of *treason* against their Sovereign and their Country!

Again; this act is not only one of defiance against the English Crown and Constitution; but it is in opposition to a recent Act of Parliament.

"And whereas the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, is by the act of union of Great Britain and Ireland, established permanently and inviolably: and whereas the right and title of Archbishops to their respective provinces, of Bishops to their sees, and of Deans to their deaneries, as well in England as in Ireland, have been settled and established by law, be it therefore enacted, that if any person, after the commencement of this act, other than the person thereunto authorized by law, shall assume or use the name, style, or title of *Archbishop* of *any province*, *Bishop* of *any bishopric*, or Dean of any deanery, *in England* or Ireland, he shall for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of one hundred pounds *."

Hence, my dear Sir, we see, by this memorable

* Burn's Ecclesiastical Law. Ed. Lond. 1842. Vol. iii. p. 175. Roman Catholic Relief Act. 10 Geo. IV. cap. 7. sect. 24.

example, how proudly the Church of Rome now lifts herself up against the powers of this World, and against HIM Whose Ministers they are! How impiously does she rebel against the Word of the Most High, speaking by the mouth of His Apostles *, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation." "Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; honour to whom honour." Whatever, therefore, may be the issue of her practices in this world, she recklessly incurs the future just judgment of Him Who has said, "The Lord knoweth to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment; chiefly them that despise government; presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities; and they shall utterly perish in their own corruption, and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness †."

I am,
My dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
CHR. WORDSWORTH.

Cloisters, Westminster,
Dec. 8, 1847.

* Rom. xiii. 1—3. 6, 7; 1 Pet. ii. 13. These, be it observed, are precepts of obedience to *civil* powers.

† 2 Pet. ii. 9—13; Jude 8.

APPENDIX.

A. Page 43.

" Rome, le 14 septembre 1847.

" MONSIEUR.

" Votre numéro du 27 août contient une lettre anonyme, datée de Rome, dans laquelle je lis les passages suivants :

" ' Le parti jésuite-rétrograde est en complot permanent contre Pie IX. . .

" ' La Sardaigne paraît soutenir Pie IX. ; mais le parti jésuite est puissant en Piémont. . .

" ' On est convaincu que le parti austro-jésuite fait tous ses efforts pour déterminer la chute du cardinal Ferretti. . .

" Malgré la répugnance que j'éprouve à saisir le public de mes justes griefs contre une malveillance obstinée, il m'est impossible, Monsieur, de laisser accréditer sans réclamation des allégations qui seraient très graves si elles n'étaient dénuées de fondement.

" J'ignore absolument, Monsieur, ce que votre correspondant a voulu dire en parlant d'un *parti jésuite*, *d'un parti jésuite-rétrograde*, *d'un parti austro-jésuite* qui se serait formé, soit à Rome, soit dans le Piémont. Les vrais Jésuites, c'est-à-dire les membres de la Compagnie de Jésus, ne sont nulle part des hommes de parti. Notre compagnie est un ordre religieux *solennellement approuvé par l'Eglise*; son but unique est celui exprimé dans son institut, la gloire de Dieu et le salut des ames ;

ses moyens sont la pratique des conseils évangéliques et le zèle dont les apôtres et les hommes apostoliques de tous les siècles lui ont donné l'exemple ; elle n'en connaît point d'autres. La politique lui est étrangère ; elle n'a jamais lié son sort à un parti, quel qu'il puisse être. Sa mission est plus grande et au-dessus de tous les partis. Fille soumise de l'Eglise, elle est à son service partout où elle veut l'employer. La calomnie peut bien se complaire à répandre des insinuations perfides et à représenter les Jésuites mêlés aux intrigues politiques, mais j'en suis encore à attendre qu'on me signale un seul des religieux qui me sont subordonnés qui se soit écarté sur ce point de l'esprit et des prescriptions les plus formelles de notre institut.

" Je ne conçois donc pas, monsieur le rédacteur, ce que votre correspondant a voulu dire par le mot *austro-jésuite*.

" Aurait-on prétendu insinuer que les Jésuites des Etats romains ont fait alliance avec l'Autriche ? Certes, c'est donner à ces religieux une singulière importance ! Mais cette supposition est tellement contraire au bon sens, à la raison, à l'évidence, qu'elle se refuse à toute réfutation.

" Aurait-on voulu faire croire que les Jésuites sont inféodés au gouvernement autrichien, et que la forme de ce gouvernement est la seule que les Jésuites entourent de leur sympathie ! C'est, monsieur le rédacteur, me fournir l'occasion d'expliquer une fois pour toutes quelle est la position que la Compagnie de Jésus à prise et qu'elle tient à conserver vis à vis de tous les gouvernements sous lesquels ses membres sont appelés à vivre.

" Comme l'Eglise, la Compagnie de Jésus n'a pour les constitutions politiques des divers Etats ni antipathie ni prédilection. Ses membres acceptent avec sincérité la forme de gouvernement sous laquelle la Providence marque leur place, soit qu'un pouvoir ami les encourage, soit qu'il se borne à respecter en eux les droits qu'il reconnaît aux autres citoyens.

" Si les institutions politiques du pays qu'ils habitent sont défectueuses, ils en supportent les défauts ; si elles se perfec-

tionnent, ils applaudissent à leurs améliorations ; si elles proclament pour les peuples de nouveaux droits, ils en revendiquent pour eux-mêmes le bénéfice ; si elles élargissent les voies de la liberté, ils en profitent pour donner plus d'extension aux œuvres de la bienfaisance et du zèle. Partout ils fléchissent sous le niveau des lois ; ils respectent les pouvoirs publics ; ils prennent tous les sentiments de bons et loyaux citoyens ; ils en partagent les charges, les épreuves et les jouissances. C'est, Monsieur, qu'aux yeux des Jésuites un suprême intérêt domine tous les autres : la félicité des hommes dans une vie meilleure et plus durable. Partout où ce but peut être atteint, les Jésuites s'acclimatent sans répugnance et sans peine.

" Voilà, monsieur le rédacteur, quels sont les principes des Jésuites par rapport aux gouvernements et à leurs diverses constitutions politiques.

" Voilà quelle est la ligne de conduite qu'ils se sont tracée et dont ils espèrent ne s'écarter jamais."

N.B. See further on this subject the *Postscript* to Letter X. of this sequel.

B. Page 83.

In Letter IV. I have brought together the various paragraphs which refer to the same topic. Here they are exhibited for the most part in the order in which they occur in the works of Pighius. The same remark applies to Ludovicus and Hosius.

Pighius, De Ecclesiâ Controv. iii. Ed. Paris. 1549. p. 90. —Sunt enim Scripturæ, velut cereus quidam nasus ; qui sicut horsum illorsumque facile se trahi permittit, et quo traxeris, haud invitus sequitur, ita et ille, se flecti, duci, atque etiam in diversam sententiam trahi, accommodarique ad quidvis patiuntur, nisi quis veram illam inflexibilemque earundem amussim, nempe, ecclesiasticæ traditionis authoritatem, communemque sententiam, iisdem adhibeat.

Ibid. p. 92.—Sed nos credere, inquit, illis non debemus ; nec exire a paterna ecclesiasticaque traditione : neque aliter un-

quam credere, nisi quemadmodum ecclesiæ tradiderunt nobis, hoc est, successio illa ecclesiastica.

Hæc est ipsissima veritatis ac pietatis regula: quam efficaciorem semper quam scripturas, ab ipso ecclesiæ initio, sanctissimi orthodoxique patres nostri semper experti sunt.

Ibid. p. 94.—Quorum non fuit hoc in scribendo consilium, ut scripta illa sua præessent nostræ religioni ac fidei, sed subessent potius*, sicut accesserunt eisdem, jam propagatis in orbem, non præcesserunt.

Pighius, De Com. sub utraque Specie. Controv. vii. p. 131. —Constat sanè B. Leonem etiam præcepto aut edicto exegisse, populi communionem sub utraque specie in Romana Ecclesia, ad confundendam Manichæorum insaniam.

Hierarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ Assertio per Al. Pighium Campensem. Ed. Coloniæ Agrip. 1558. Lib. i. fo. 9.—Itaque, ut revertamur ad institutum, certum est ab illorum autoritate non dependisse ab initio certitudinem nostræ religionis ac fidei, sed contra magis illorum autoritatem à certitudine fidei religionisque nostræ, quemadmodum accesserunt, ut audisti, fidei religionisque nostræ jam diffusæ in orbem, non præcesserunt. Nullum adhuc publice in ecclesia legebatur scriptum evangelium cum Apostolica autoritas summa cum severitate decerneret anathema, quicunque evangelizaret aliud evangelium præter id, quod in ecclesia jam evangelizatum erat. Non ergo ex scriptis à Matthæo, Marco, Luca et Joanne evangeliis ab initio accepit Christi Ecclesia, quod crederet; sed illa ecclesiæ fidei accesserunt, et ab ea suam, quæ ad nos attinet, autoritatem sortiti sunt, aut ut significantius dicam, suæ autoritatis fidem indubiumque testimonium.

* * * * *

Omnem evangeliorum autoritatem nobis dependere ex autoritate Ecclesiæ.

Itaque etiam viventibus Marco et Luca, evangeliis eorum non propter ipsos fides est habita, etiam ab iis, qui certo sciebant ea scripta ab illis, atque adeo qui eorum habebant autographa, sed propter illam apostolorum ecclesiam, quæ ipsis testimonium veritatis perhibuit.

* Evangelica scripta ab initio subfuisse non præfuisse fidei ecclesiæ.

[illegible]hius Hierarch. Eccles. Lib. i. fo. 11.—Nunquid Scriptu[illegible] sunt enim illæ veluti plumbea quædam Lesbiæ ædificationis regula, quæ ad sensum, quem quis ante secum præsumpserit, accommodari se facile patiantur. Quid igitur? hoc, inquit, habet autoritas matris ecclesiæ; hæc, illa fundatissimæ veritatis regula: hoc, illud adamantinum inflexibileque robur: hic, ille inexpugnabilis murus.

* * * * *

Habemus igitur, non solum non inferiorem, non solum parem item et quodammodo superiorem, et notiorem Ecclesiæ autoritatem autoritate scripturarum. Siquidem scripturis quibusdam, eisque præcipuis, hoc est, evangelistarum, quam neque ex se, neque ex scriptoribus suis apud nos habebant, canonicam impertita est autoritatem: aliis vero quam ex autoribus suis habebant, autoritatem conservavit, easque veluti chirographi aut sigilli suo certo testimonio communitas ad nos certa fide deduxit.

* * * * *

Veteris equidem instrumenti canonicas scripturas autographas periisse universas Babylonico illo incendio una cum arca fœderis, in qua asservabatur, tradit antiquitas. Et si adhuc extarent, nihilo majorem apud nos invenirent autoritatem aut fidem, quam quæ nunc leguntur eorundem exemplaria, nisi extrinsecus accepto testimonio, quod vere essent illa autographa, suo illo seculo sub certa divinæ attestationis fide tradita tunc viventi ecclesiæ, et ita recepta ab eadem. Perinde enim ac apud nos prolata instrumenta publica, notarii publici ac authentici subscripta manu, sed quæ nobis una cum ipso notario plane essent incognita. Exemplaribus autem illis quæ habemus et legimus, scripturarum, nulla apud nos major fides aut autoritas esse possit quam quibuslibet scripturis Apocryphis, aut quam esset illi scripturæ, cujus paulo ante meminimus, quæ Petri se mentiebatur evangelium, nisi nobis commendarent ecclesiæ testimonio. Nihilo eorum plus illud Petri non esse, quam hoc esse Matthæi, Joannis, Marci, Lucæ, quæ denique hæc Moysi, Esaiæ, Hieremiæ, cæterorumque quorum titulos præferunt, nobis

possit constare. Propter Ecclesiam ergo solam, ejusque autoritatem, nunc credimus scripturæ universæ.

Ibid. fo. 12.—Quam scripturarum autoritate demonstravimus in nullo inferiorem, imo quanto eo major sit, in sequenti oratione conabimur explicare accuratius. Certe ab ea scripturarum omnem autoritatem nobis dependere, et magnam earum partem, universam suam autoritatem ab ea accepisse, jam nunc fecimus evidentissimum.

* * * * *

Autoritatem ecclesiasticæ traditionis, incertitudine quidem veritatis esse parem autoritati scripturarum, sed eandem notiorem nobis, et ad longe plura se extendere. Cap. iii.

"Scripture to be interpreted by Pope," 147 D, 153, who has autoritatem definiendi omnem ex lege et scripturis exortam quæstionem, cujus sententiam absque ulla exceptione sequi oportet, p. 160, C. Ab uno Romano Pontifice ejusque cathedra expectetur ab orbe toto dogmatica veræ fidei definitio.

Ibid. fo. 144.—Nec scripsisse illas ecclesiæ catholicæ, sed singulas singulis ecclesiis particularibus aut personis, ut quæque scribendi peculiarem causam exhibuit. Id quod evidenter convincitur in ea quæ ad Philemonem scripta est epistola. Quæ præter familiarem commendationem et deprecationem pro uno Onesimo servo ejus fugitivo, nihil prorsus continet. Quam certum est, in hoc scriptam non fuisse à Paulo, ut publice legeretur in catholica Christi ecclesia.

Ibid. fo. 17.—Magis idoneam et efficaciorem esse ecclesiasticæ traditionis autoritatem, quam scripturarum, in re dubia, ad fidem certitudinemque faciendam; etiam, ubi id, de quo agitur, ex scripturis constare poterit. Cap. iv.

Quandoquidem clariorem esse constat, magisque apertam et plane inflexibilem communem ecclesiæ sententiam, traditionemque ecclesiasticam. Cum contra scripturæ plurimum frequenter obscuritatis habeant, et se trahi, accommodarique in diversam, et ad eam quam quis secum antepræsumpsit sententiam, et eludi cauta expositione, facile permittant.

* * * * *

Sunt enim, inquit, multa in scripturis divinis, quæ trahi possunt ad eum sensum, quem sibi unusquisque præsumit.

Hierarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ lib. i. fo. 20.—Quoniam sive defenderis tu quid, sive negaveris, scripturas veluti Lesbiæ ædificationis plumbeam quandam regulam, ingenii versutia, in contrarium sibi accommodabunt.

Ibid. fo. 27.—Operæ precium mihi videtur hoc loco meminisse memorabilis cujusdam exempli, quod olim puer audisse memini. Eximius quidam sacrarum literarum professor, cum in simplicissimum quendam, qui sibi videbatur, incidisset hominem carbonarium, animi causa, et curiositate quadam tentandi simplicitatem hominis, percunctabatur illum de sua fide, quid crederet. Qui cum præter generales illos articulos fidei de Deo, quos frequenter audiendo in ecclesia didicerat, ac memoriæ commendaverat, ad cætera interrogata omnia, nihil responderet aliud, quam hoc, se credere, quod ecclesia crederet. De ecclesiæ tamen fide nihil habens definiti ac expliciti, interrogantem de ea, velut circulo quodam eludebat. Hoc enim de singulis, ultra interrogatus, ecclesiam aiebat credere, quod ipse crederet: et hoc se quod ecclesia; fit postea, ut idem Theologus ex gravissimo morbo decumbens, et in vitæ periculum incidens, astu suggestuque Satanæ graviter tentaretur de fide. Unde sese aliter explicare non potuit, quam recordatione simplicis quidem, sed tutissimæ fidei illius carbonarii; ad quam in æstu illo tentationis, conquassatus vehementer, et distractus, veluti ad securissimum quendam portum confugere coactus fuit, ita ut subinde clara voce exclamaret, ut carbonarius; mirabantur assidentes, et ex vi morbi delirare hominem, et aliena loqui credebant. Quem postea convalescentem interrogant, quid sibi voluisset in illo agone suo, ita frequenter et vehementer exclamans (ûti carbonarius), ille vero universam illis rem explicat ordine. Et quod in illa agonia sua, quemadmodum ille carbonarius, ad fidem catholicæ ecclesiæ, velut ad tutissimum asylum semper confugisset. In qua una in eo necessitatis articulo plus invenisset præsidii, quàm in omni, quam tota vita meditatus fuerat, exercitatione Scripturarum, divinæ misericordiæ hoc

acceptum referens, quod incidisset in simplicem illu[illegible] narium.

Hierarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ lib. iv. fo. 147.—Nec est quod ad Scripturarum judicium quisquam dicat referendas quæstiones et controversias ejusmodi. Primum, quoniam Scripturæ sunt muti judices.

Ibid. lib. v. fo. 211.—(*Margin.*) Scripturas facile applicari impiæ cuivis sententiæ.

C. Page 88.

Lud. Maj. Gravin. Oratio ad Patres Concil. Trident. missa. Concilia, Labbe, Ed. Paris, 1672. Tom. iv. p. 1867.—Sciebat enim divinus ille doctor *qui raptus fuit usque ad tertium cœlum, et audivit arcana verba, quæ non licet homini loqui*, Ecclesiam Dei esse vivum pectus Christi, Scripturam vero quasi mortuum atramentum, et idcirco longe potius credendum esse vivo pectori, quam mortuo atramento, hoc est, majorem fidem esse habendam viventi ecclesiæ, quam per se velut mortuis codicibus. Sciebat quoque Christum non membranulas, non macrocola, non chartulas, non scriptiones, non literarum monumenta, sed exempla, sed præcepta, sed instituta, sed mandata, sed consulta discipulis suis dedisse, et reliquisse: ut ob id apud posteros testatum relinqueret, quid ipse doctor et magister omnium hac de re non obscure sentiret, nempe, quod potius consultis, mandatis, institutis, præceptis atque exemplis, quam literarum monumentis, quam scriptionibus, quam chartulis, quam macrocolis, quam membranulis standum erat. Sciebat item, traditiones et pias religionis consuetudines corrumpi et adulterari non posse, quia religiose, sancte, et accurate servantur, suntque quotidie in usu, et in oculis omnium: sacras autem tabulas, et ipsos quamvis divinæ autoritatis codices, non modo multis et variis causis adulterari et corrumpi, verum etiam eorum verba atque sententias, per se licet integras et incorruptas, depravari tandem aliquando ac pro hominum ingeniis et institutis, in utramque partem deflecti et contorqueri posse.

Ibid. p. 1869.—Utinam, patres, hæc omnia placide, et sine animi perturbatione veteris disciplinæ eversores meditarentur. Fortassis enim non ex scriptione, quæ in literis est (ex quibus pro ingeniis et cupiditatibus hominum, ac prout quisque ad aliquod magnum facinus obeundum, vel opinionibus vulgi, vel suapte conjectura et sensu rapitur, contrariæ et innumerabiles, ut quotidie videmus, sententiæ fingi et deduci possunt) sed ex communi totius ecclesiæ sensu atque consensu, in quo nec errare aliquo modo possumus, nec prolapsio aut flagitium ullum esse potest; sed ex communi consuetudine, ob quam ipsas etiam leges rescindere aliquando et abrogare licet; sed ex communi re et salute, pro qua quisque probe institutus mortem etiam oppetere debet, divina evangeliorum testimonia et sacras tabulas interpretarentur.

D. Page 92.

Bp. Jewel. Ed. Lond. 1609. "Defense of the Apologie of the Church of England." Part iv. p. 422.—But touching Hosius, ye condemn us utterly, either of ignorance or of malice, for the words, wherein we find such fault, were uttered by him, as you say, not as any part of his own judgement, but only as in the person of the Heretic Zuenkfeldius. Therefore ye say: *We charge him wrongfully with the allowing of that thing, which he expressly and plainly reproveth.*

First of all, the Author of the Apologie protesteth, that if there were any oversight herein, it proceeded only of error, and not of malice; as it may well appear in that he was not deceived alone. For if he were deceived in mistaking these words, divers others, the best learned of this age, have been deceived therein as well as he. *Nicolaus Gallus* hereof writeth thus: *Hosius Cardinalis, Legatus Sanctissimi, et Præsidens Concilii Tridentini, in suo libro, de Expresso Verbo Dei, ait, Nos verò Dei de Cœlo sententiam potiùs expectabimus, &c. Non oportet Legis aut Scripturæ esse peritum, sed à Deo doctum. Vanus est labor, qui Scripturis impenditur. Scriptura enim creatura est, et egenum quoddam Elementum:* Cardinal Hosius, Legate unto the most

Holy Father, and President of the Council of Trident, in his Book, De Expresso Verbo Dei, saith thus:—"We will rather wait for God's will from Heaven, &c. It behoveth not a man to be skilful in the Law of God, or in the Scriptures, but to be taught of God. It is but lost labour that is spent in the Scriptures. For the Scripture is a Creature, and a poor kind of outward Element." Thus Nicolaus Gallus burdeneth your own Catholic Friend Hosius with these words, and not the Heretic Zuenkfeldius.

Likewise saith Flacius Illyricus, speaking of the same words of Hosius: "Unum locum ex plurimis proferam, in quo Hosius, alterius cujusdam sententiam de hac re citans, comprobat: Nos Dei de Cœlo sententiam potius expectabimus, &c. Vanus est labor, qui Scripturis impenditur:" One place I will alledge out of many, where Hosius bringing in the saying of one certain man (meaning Zuenkfeldius), alloweth well of the same. "These words," saith Illyricus, "Hosius uttereth in the name and person of Zuenkfeldius: yet, nevertheless, he alloweth them as his own."

To like purpose writeth Jacobus Andreæ: who, after he had reported all the foresaid words, in the end concludeth thus: "Hactenus Hosius: quæ verba sive Hosius suo sive aliorum nomine recitet, certè hanc esse Asoti et Hosii de Sacra Scriptura sententiam, non est obscurum." Thus far Hosius: which words howsoever Hosius report them, either in his own name, or in the name of some other, without all doubt, this is the judgment that both Asotus and Hosius have of the Holy Scripture.

So likewise saith that most grave and learned Father Johannes Brentius: "Interea vociferantur, Sacram Scripturam esse dubiam, ambiguam, præceptorem mutum, literam occidentem, literam mortuam: adeòque, si Reverendis illis Patribus libuerit, Æsopi Fabulas:" In the meanwhile they cry out that the Holy Scriptures are blind and doubtful, a dumb schoolmaster, a killing writ, a dead letter: yea, and if it shall like these Reverend Fathers, no better than Æsop's Fables. Perhaps ye will say of these learned men, as ye say of some others; they

had only their patched note-books, and scattered authorities, by scraps and pieces, here and there a line or two, and understood not what they wrote. Notwithstanding whatsoever it shall please you to say, as therein your grace is very great, yet you see by these few, and must needs confess, if the author of the Apology, touching this place of Hosius, were happily overseen by errour, yet he had so many of the best learned of this age to keep him company in his errour. "Verily, they say not as you say," thus saith Zuenkfeldius: "They say as we say," thus saith Hosius. If Hosius were able to blind so many, we must think he was a skilful writer.

The fairest colour ye can lay hereon is this: howsoever these words be uttered by Hosius, yet was this no part of his meaning. Yet Jacobus Andreæ saith: "Hanc esse Asoti et Hosii sententiam, non est obscurum." Without doubt, this is the very meaning of Asotus and Hosius. And Illyricus saith, "Hosius alleging the saying of one certain man," whereby he meaneth the heretic Zuenkfeldius, "alloweth well of the same."

Thus M. Harding, Ye teach the people to reverence and weigh the Word of God. Ye call it dead ink: a lifeless matter: a dumb judge that cannot speak: a black Gospel: inken divinity: a nose of wax: and a thing utterly void of authority of itself. Examine these places: weigh these words. They are no lies: they are no slanders. Judge uprightly: remove affection: ye shall find that Hosius and Zuenkfeldius, and all the rest of your brethren, touching the authority and credit of God's word, accord in one; for proof whereof when objection was made, that King David, being not a bishop, but only a temporal prince, had written the Psalms, that is to say, the very key of the Scriptures." Hosius made answer: "Quidni scriberet? Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim. Wrote David Psalms? and why should he not write them? Horace saith: We write ballads every body, learned and unlearned, tag and rag." So unreverently and like a heathen, he scorneth and scoffeth at the Scriptures of God, and likeneth the heavenly ditties of the Holy Ghost to a vile, heathenish, wanton

ballad. This in Zuenkfeldius had been great blasphemy: ye allow it in Hosius as a virtue.

* * * * *

Therefore Hosius, by his episcopal authority, pronounceth sentence definitive in this wise: "Quod Ecclesia docet, expressum Dei Verbum est: quod contra sensum et consensum Ecclesiæ docetur, expressum Diaboli verbum est." Whatsoever the Church teacheth (by the Church he meaneth the Pope, and his Cardinals, and the Church of Rome, &c.) that is the express Word of God: whatsoever is taught against the meaning and consent of the Church, that is the express word of the Devil.

This was sometimes an ordinary practice of sundry old heretics, to scorn and to disdain the Scriptures of God; and to ground themselves upon other conclusions and imaginations of their own. So the heretic Carpocrates said, "He knew more than either Christ Himself or His Apostles."

Tertullian saith: "Discipuli Montani dicunt, Paracletum plura in Montano dixisse, quàm Christum in Evangelio protulisse: nec tantum plura, sed etiam meliora atque majora." The disciples of Montanus the heretic said, that the Holy Ghost uttered more things in Montanus, their master, than ever Christ uttered in the Gospel: and not only more things, but also greater and better things. And again they said: "Paulus ex parte sciebat, et ex parte prophetabat. Nondum enim venerat quod perfectum est." Paul knew in part, and prophesied in part. For the perfection (that was afterward in Montanus) was not yet come. Therefore it is not universally true, M. Harding, that you say, *All heretics have alleged the Scriptures;* for some heretics, in whose steps ye seem to tread, have made light of and disdained the Scriptures as well as you. But as some heretics have alleged the Scriptures, as you do, without sense, even so all heretics are evermore reproved by the Scriptures, as you be. And that is the cause that you and your fellows, for the most part, so fearfully shun the Scriptures. For he that doeth evil fleeth the light.

Therefore, whereas ye call us forth, and bid us humbly to cry

you mercy, first bid Hosius, your schoolmaster, to recant his errours: will him to speak more reverently of God's word; for it is holy. Let him confess, and repent his blasphemy, in comparing the Scriptures of God with heathenish ballads. Recant you the errours that Pighius, Cusanus, Eckius, and others your doctors and fellows have set abroad: and the author of the Apology shall do whatsoever shall behove him.

E. Page 96.

Hosius, p. 530, (*Margin.*)—Apostoli pauca scripserunt, et multa sine scripto tradiderunt.

(*Margin.*) Salvat Charitas, etiam sine Scripturæ scientia.

Ibid. p. 531.—Negat Brentius jus interpretandæ Scripturæ esse penes summos Pontifices, quod donum interpretandæ Scripturæ non sit humanæ prudentiæ, sed Sancti Spiritus.

Idem, De Expresso Dei Verbo, p. 623.—Etiam si minus aperta videri possent alicui Scripturæ verba, quæ talis profert, quoniam tamen Ecclesiæ sensu profert, expressum Dei Verbum profert . . . . Sunt enim multa in Scripturis divinis, quæ possunt ad eum sensum trahi, quem unusquisque sibi præsumit.

Idem, De Expresso Dei Verbo, p. 627.—Qua de re igitur queritaris, ò Satana? Quid hac inani tota, de expresso Dei Verbo, jactantia, toties aures nostras obtundis? Cum quicquid Scripturis profertur, modò sanus adsit earum intellectus, magis ad receptum Ecclesiæ morem comprobandum, quam ad tuum istum errorem tuendum facere videatur. Verum nihil est quod homo Christianus existimet de calice tantopere Satanam laborare. Non ignorat ille, nihil ad salutem referre, utatur quis calice, necne, quum per membra sua Lutherum, Bucerum, Philippum, non obscure fateatur, nihil de calice sumendo, tanquam ad salutem necessarium a Christo præceptum esse. Scit ille, longe verissimum esse, quod a Patribus in Concilio Basiliensi, quod hac quidem in parte receptum et approbatum esse constat, decretum fuit; sive sub una, sive sub utraque specie

quis communicet, secundum ordinationem et observantiam Ecclesiæ, proficere digne communicantibus ad salutem. Itaque non hoc eum offendit, quod sub una specie communicatur, nec hoc urget, ut sub duplici communicetur; sed quod fit secundum ordinationem seu observantiam Ecclesiæ; quoniam sic demum, et non aliter proficere communicantibus ad salutem intelligit, hoc est, quod eum offendit maxime; ac ne communicetur hoc modo, nimirum secundum ordinationem seu observantiam Ecclesiæ, hoc est quod instat et urget maxime. Satanas vult esse Satanas: Satanam Hebræi vocant adversarium: vult igitur adversari Christo, et capiti et corpori. Est ordinatio seu observantia Christi corporis Ecclesiæ, ut sub una communicetur? vult sub utraque. Est ordinatio seu observantia Christi corporis Ecclesiæ, ut sub utraque specie communicetur? vult vel sub una, vel sub neutra communicare.

Hosius, De Sacro vernacule Legendo, Harp. p. 662.—Quid si qui minus intelligunt, ea quæ dicuntur a sacerdote, majorem in eis persæpe videre licet pietatis affectum, contra frigus in illis ingens, qui non verba magis quam sententiam quoque verborum assequuntur? Non omnia in intelligendo consistunt.

Ibid. p. 663.—Ex divinis officiis vernacule decantatis, plus diminutum pietatis, quàm accesserit.

Ibid. p. 664. Quare sit orandum potius lingua Latina quàm vernacula, Gen. iii.—Quis enim præstabit si sua quæque gens dialecto sacras precationes et lectiones versas habuerit, nullus ut error in vertendo committatur? Atqui nusquam erratur quam in hac parte periculosius, et est usu compertum, versiones istas literarum sanctarum in linguam gentis alicujus vernaculam, multa in Ecclesiæ Dei incommodi attulisse, nam præterquam quod ista omnium omnia intelligenda, ac plusquam oportet sapiendi nimia quædam aviditas eundem prope nostris temporibus fructum attulisse videtur, quem attulerat primis parentibus nostris esus ligni scientiæ boni et mali, dum ex bonis Latinis mala Germanica fecit Martinus Lutherus, sacris bibliis vertendis, plus eum quam sexcentos errores admisisse a catholicis animadversum est.

Ibid. p. 665.—Hunc fructum et apud finitimos, et apud nos quibusdam in locis videmus nunc et ingemiscimus, ex hac divinarum Scripturarum in vernaculam linguam versione. Quin audire etiam quosdam licet dicentes: Ego ipse pastor esse animæ meæ, et ejus curam gerere teneor; si quid erratum a me fuerit, Episcopus pro me supplicium gehennæ non luet. Estne autem hoc illi Dei Verbo consentaneum?

Hosius, De Expresso Dei Verbo, tom. ii. p. 3.—Ac proinde Hosium libello hoc suo prodere suam ipsius et suorum omnium Antichristianam plane impietatem, dum sub ementito Ecclesiæ titulo, Christum Dominum sibi, non autem se Christo Domino in verbi sui divini doctrina subjicere conatur. (This is quoted by Hosius as the objection of his adversary; and a very just one it is.)

Ibid. p. 5.—Scriptura vero pendet, quæ non aliter verbum esse Dei censeri debet, nisi quatenus Ecclesiæ fuerit authoritate comprobata.

* * * * *

Jam igitur habes Lasce, quomodo Scriptura pendeat ab authoritate, testimonio, et approbatione Ecclesiæ, et quemadmodum, illo demum sensu Scriptura verum et expressum Dei verbum est, qui fuerit Ecclesiæ Catholicæ judicio comprobatus, non autem quem sibi quisque finxit.

Ibid. p. 11.—Cæterum si quis ab Ecclesiæ sensu et consensu discrepat, etiamsi Scripturarum examina producat, Diaboli verbum proferre potest, Dei verbum proferre non potest.

Hosius, tom. i. p. 516. De Auctoritate S. Scripturæ, lib. iii. —Quamobrem nihil est, quod majore cum periculo sit conjunctum, quam si quis de Scripturis cum Satana certamen inire velit: præcipue pro tempore gravis agon instat, cum anima venit a corpore separanda: tum vero tutissimum fuerit exemplum sequi Carbonarii cujusdam: ex quo cùm animi causa vir quidam doctus quæsivisset, quod crederet, Symbolum recitavit. Cum interrogaret ille quid præterea crederet, respondit: Quod Ecclesia credit Catholica. Ille vero: Quid credit Ecclesia? Quod ego, inquit, credo. Cumque subinde ille quæreret, circulo

hoc usus carbonarius ; nihil aliud respondit, quam se credere, quod Ecclesia credit : Ecclesiam credere, quod ipse crederet : nec aliud ab illo quicquam elicere potuit.

Ibid. p. 530.—Fingamus autem nunc esse, quod tu scripsisse nescio quem narras : nam nomen non exprimis, ac fieri potest ut sit commentum tuum : Scripturas valere quantum fabulas Æsopi, si destituantur auctoritate Ecclesiæ. Cedo, Brenti, num hic minus reverenter de Scripturis loquutus est, quam qui vocat eam librum hæreticorum, cùm tamen nullorum fit minus quam hæreticorum : est enim Catholicorum propria, qui tot seculis in ejus possessione præscripserunt. Et potuit illud tamen pio sensu dici, quem homo pius, qui charitatem habet, qui non cogitat malum, ex iis verbis eliceret : nam revera, nisi nos Ecclesiæ doceret auctoritas hanc Scripturam esse canonicam, perexiguum apud nos pondus haberet.

Ejusdem Stanislai Hosii Cardinalis Testamentum, (Ibid. p. 483, tom. ii.) Quicunque tecum, Pie Pontifex, non colligit, spargit : qui Christi non est, Antichristi est : *qui Papista non* est, *Satanista* est. Nullum itaque primum nisi Christum sequens tuæ beatitudini, id est, Cathedræ Petri communione consocior. Super hanc Petram Ecclesiam ædificatam esse scio. Cui si quis jungitur meus est ; huic igitur adhærere, nec unquam ab ea quoad Spiritus hos reget artus avelli me velle clara voce pronuncio. Ac secundum illud quo Christiani censemur omnes, *nullum* vel *gloriosius*, vel salutare magis *nomen* mihi tribui posse persuasum habeo, quàm si *Papista* vocer.

Ibid. Judicium et Censura de Adoran. Trinit. p. 669.—Cum enim non e vestra magis parte, quam ab omni alia nefaria dissensione et sacrilega divisione semper abhorruerimus : nec alia res ulla majori nobis curæ fuerit, quam ut cum orbe terrarum in Christi pace, in Ecclesiæ Catholicæ unitate, in fraterna charitate, quem vos Papatum vocatis, permanere possemus, usque eo etiam ut si quis nos hac de causa Papistas appellare vellet, non solum nihil nos ejus appellationis puderet : verum etiam cum primis id amplum nobis ad laudem et gloriam esse judicaremus.

Hosius, tom. ii. p. 369, Andrææ Comiti à Gorka, epist. ccix. —Hortatur ut ne erubescat esse et dici Papista.

Semper ego D. V. Papistam, hoc est, Christianum esse judicavi, quamvis ut hominum voculas, quibuscum versatur, effugeret, minus apertè Christum quandoque confessa fuerit.

In like manner, Cardinal Baronius *claims* for Romanists the title of *Papist*, which modern Roman Catholics appear to resent. "Certe" (says he, ad Martyr. Rom. Oct. 16) "nullo sublimiore gloriæ titulo exornare nos potuissent. Sint ideo hæc semper nobis præconia laudum ut dicamur *Papistæ*."

F. Page 101.

Hosius, Epist. p. 239. Antonio Cardinali Amulio, Epist. xcv. —Pauli Manutii typis excudi lucubratiunculas nostras, et quidem Romæ, diligenter etiam in id opus incumbi, lubens admodum ex litteris Illustrissimæ D. V. cognovi, cui magnam hoc nomine debeo gratiam, quando quidem id illius opera potissimum est effectum, ut labores nostri tanti fierent. De sententia quadam Gregorii Nysseni, ubi de oblatione in cœna agitur, magnam audio fuisse disceptationem: ferendane esset, an auferenda ex libro. Video quod medium quiddam estis secuti. Nam nec ferre, nec auferre voluistis integram, sed priore particula posita reliquum omne, quod sequebatur, et quod ad rem faciebat maximè, sustulistis. * * *

Sæpe cum in urbe essem, nostram hanc infelicitatem deploravi, idque tanto magis, quod acciderat, ut cum a Bibliopolis emere vellem quatuor præcipuorum Ecclesiæ Doctorum opera, negaret Bibliopola licere sibi vendere, quod Edicto Pontificis cautum esset, ne faceret. Hic ego liberius fortasse, quam illa tempora ferebant, sed justo, sicut mihi visum erat, dolore percitus. Quid est hoc, inquam? Itane conceduntur hæreticis arma, quibus Ecclesiam oppugnare possint? Catholicis contra, qui pro virili sua tueri illam ac defendere sunt parati, auferuntur? Cur in eam potius curam non incumbimus, ut qui libri sunt hæreticorum opera depravati, correctos eos et emendatos

recudendos curemus, quo sic non destituantur suis etiam armis Catholici? Vidisse me cum corrupta moneta prohiberetur, quod non defuerit alia, qua liceret nihilominus necessaria sibi quemque comparare. Nunc autem omnis moneta prorsus interdicitur, nec alia melior excuditur ac prohibetur ne cum sanctis illis Patribus, a quibus recta fide imbuti, et ad omnem pietatem sumus instructi, commercii quicquam habeamus. Has ex me voces plures tum audiverunt, etiam ex Collegio, in quod uterque nostrum postea fuit co-optatus, quas certe justus quidam dolor extorserat. Nam unde nobis natæ sunt centuriæ, quarum Illust. D. V. suis in literis meminit, quam ex eo, quod et in edendis, et in evolvendis, priscorum Patrum libris, tantum studii posuerunt hæretici, cum a nobis, qui per Dei gratiam Catholici sumus, prorsus negligi viderentur. Multos cernere licuit proximis superioribus annis, qui præter Thomam aut Scotum vix alium quenquam authorem legerent, quodque magis dolendum est, ne sacra quidem Biblia, quæ diligentius evolverent, digna judicarunt.

Hosius, tom. ii. p. 327. Alphonso Salmerono Societatis Jesu Theologo Epist. clxviii.—Venerunt huc Theologi Parisienses, mirari satis non possunt Romæ tantam esse librorum sacrorum penuriam.

G. Page 117.

P. Nic. de Cusa Card. Opera, Basil. 1566. Epist. ad Bohemos, p. 833.—Et pro infallibili regula salutis nostræ, Christus hanc tradidit Ecclesiæ potestatem et auctoritatem, ut cum in unitate cum ipsa persistimus, quæ Cathedræ Petri adhæret, per quam successores etiam malorum Christo capiti alligat, errare à via salutis non possumus, etiamsi in ipsa Ecclesia alius sic, alius sic vadat. Dices fortassis, Ecclesia hodierna non ita ambulat in ritu communionis, sicut ante ista tempora, quando sanctissimi viri utriusque speciei sacramentum necessarium esse vi præcepti Christi et verbo et opere astruebant. Potuitne tunc Ecclesia errari? Certe non. Quod si non; quomodo id hodie verum

non est, quod tunc omnium opinione affirmabatur, cum non sit alia Ecclesia ista quam illa? Certe hoc te non moveat, quod diversis temporibus alius et alius ritus sacrificiorum et etiam sacramentorum stante veritate invenitur, scripturasque esse ad tempus adaptatas et varie intellectas, ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem universalem ritum exponerentur, mutato ritu iterum sententia mutaretur. Christus enim, Cui Pater regnum cœleste terrenumque tradidit, in utroque præsidens, miro ordine angelorum hominumque mysteria pro temporum varietate dispensat, et quæ singulis temporibus congruunt, vel occulta inspiratione, vel evidentiori illustratione, suggerit. * * * * * * Quare etiam si hodie alia fuerit interpretatio Ecclesiæ ejusdem præcepti Evangelici quam aliquando, tamen hic sensus nunc in usu currens, ad regimen Ecclesiæ inspiratus uti tempori congruus, ut salutis via debet acceptari.

Ibid. p. 834.—Unde Scripturæ de benè esse regiminis Ecclesiæ etiam inceptæ et continuatæ, nequaquam de essentia existere possunt: quia per imperium alicujus tyranni Antichristi omnes cremari et de mundo tolli possent, ut quondam libri veteris testamenti, per Esdram laboriose recuperati. Unde cum hoc possibile sit, non erunt de essentia Ecclesiæ Scripturæ cremabiles, Ecclesia semper persistente. Et nunc manifestum est, cum in veritate persisteret hoc (ut verius) sequendum, quod universalius communiusque esset, illisque ex symbolo Apostolico necessario communicandum, qui majorem sanioremque Ecclesiæ partem efficerent. Videmus etiam in Scripturarum intelligentia, varia hominum ingenia varios sensus explicare, variamque auctoritatis Scripturarum opinionem existere, possibileque fore aut in auctoritate earundem aut intellectuum inextricabilem dubietatem, hominum mentes suspendere: ubi erit solidum refugium peregrinantium? Certè in alio nullo quam in militantis Ecclesiæ usu atque approbatione, sive hoc sit circa Scripturam, et ejus auctoritatem atque intellectum, sive extra Scripturam in consuetudine accepta per Ecclesiam. In his enim firmitas est, ut in solida petra ac veritatis columna lex exarata quæ talia

dictat acceptanda sit, aut sententia cui obediendum, aut opere in quo concurrendum.

* * * * *

Tamen possibile non est, Scripturam quamcunque sive ipsa præceptum sive consilium contineat, in eos qui apud Ecclesiam existunt, plus auctoritatis ligandi habere aut solvendi fideles, quam ipsa Ecclesia voluerit, aut verbo aut opere expresserit. Si enim dictaverit præceptum, ut Dei præceptum in scriptis redactum acceptandum, per medium Ecclesiæ auctoritas manifestata reverenter est amplectenda. Si vero Scripturam acceptat, et ipsam per communem usum etiam aliter quam priores practicando intelligit, ita cum tali intellectu auctoritatem habeat. Si ut Concilium dixerit Ecclesia, Scripturam etiam in verbis præceptivis explicatam, verbo vel praxi acceptandam, cum non habeat aliud auctoritatis, quam uti per Ecclesiam dictatur, non ad verba, sed ad experimentalem sensum Ecclesiæ obliget, quoniam Ecclesia est, quæ non habet maculam neque rugam erroris et falsitatis. Est enim Corpus Christi, qui est veritas, et sic spiritu veritatis continue vegetatur et regitur, quia in Ecclesia loquitur Christus, et in Christo Ecclesia. Augustinus super Psal. 30, et in sermone ejusdem de die Pentecostes, et ipsa Ecclesia de se ipsa hoc testimonium perhibet in oratione, quam per ordinatos fundit in die parasceves. Dicetis forsitan, præcepta Christi quomodo mutabuntur auctoritate Ecclesiæ, ut sint tunc obligatoria, quando Ecclesiæ placuerit? Dico nulla esse Christi præcepta quam per Ecclesiam pro talibus accepta, ut præhabitum est. Si igitur constat Ecclesiam illa præcepta ut talia laudare, illis ut Christi præceptis obediendum esse nemo ambigit. Si vero circa præcepti intellectum et ejus expositionem diversitas concurrat, aut ex loco aut tempore, hic intellectus laudatus intelligitur quem major vel sanior pars verbo aut opere approbat, eo non obstante, quod aliquando alius intellectus in practica viguerit. Et non est hæc mutatio, tanquam a minori auctoritate quam Christi præcipientis dependens, quoniam Ecclesia quæ est Corpus Christi et ejus Spiritu vege-

tatur non aliud agit quam Christus vult. Et ita mutatio ista interpretationis, a Christi voluntate ita nunc volentis inspirante dependet, sicut præceptum ipsum quondam juxta illius temporis convenientiam aliter practicatum; et propterea hæc ligandi et solvendi potestas non minor est in Ecclesia quam in Christo.

* * * * *

Habemus itaque, si ab omnibus scrupulositatibus circa præcepta et eorum intelligentiam, aut variam Ecclesiæ consuetudinem intelligendi aut operandi secundum præcepta Christi aut patrum, erui voluerimus, ad Ecclesiam firma fide et confidenter recurrere, aliud si extra ipsam invenerimus, pro nostra salute minime curantes. Forte cogitatis in his dictis meis hoc dubium remanere, ex quo reprehensionis vestræ sumimus argumentum: puta, dicitis de Ecclesiæ potestate, nemo catholicus ambigit. Sed quod illa veritatis columna sit, quæ cathedræ Petri ac Romanæ sedi adhæret, nondum probatum est sufficienter.—He then endeavours to prove that point.

Ibid. epist. vii. p. 855.—Probatur etiam communionem non esse de præcepto Christi, quia dicit constitutio: Nisi de consilio sacerdotis ad tempus abstineat. Pendet igitur a consilio sacerdotis communio. Sic et Nicæna Synodus post concessionem viatici, adhuc hoc remisit ad curam et probationem Episcopi: 26. q. 6, de his in fine. Non est ergo de præcepto Christi, nisi eo modo quo Ecclesia auctoritate Christi præcipit. Papa autem est summus sacerdos et magister omnium, ut definivit illa synodus Lateranensis in C. Antiqua, et omnia alia Concilia quæ præcesserunt. Quare ad ejus consilium est in hoc maxime recurrendum, et ei acquiescendum.

Ibid. p. 857.—Ex præmissis constat, quod tota Catholica Ecclesia non potest ad literam Scripturarum obligari, licet semper ad spiritum: quando enim litera non servit ædificationi et spiritui, recipit id quod magis servit spiritui. Ita Paulus Apostolus se aiebat ministrum novi testamenti, non literæ sed spiritus. Et ideo qui cum humanis rationibus ex litera Ecclesiam nituntur impuguare, errant. Nam Ecclesia sine litera fuit aliquando, ante Moysen, et etiam antequam Apostolus Joannes

Evangelium, vel Paulus Epistolas scripserit. Et Christus Ecclesiam ædificavit sine litera, quia nihil scripsit. Non est igitur litera, quæ per tyrannum penitus deleri posset, de essentia Ecclesiæ, sed spiritus est qui vivificat. Quare nec mirum, si praxis Ecclesiæ uno tempore interpretatur Scripturam uno modo, et alio tempore alio modo. Nam intellectus currit cum praxi. Intellectus enim qui cum praxi concurrit, est spiritus vivificans.

Ibid. p. 858.—Ita potest dici de aliis consimilibus Scripturis, etiam de illa, Nisi manducaveritis. Ecclesia igitur sicut recepit Scripturam, ita et interpretatur. Sequuntur igitur Scripturæ Ecclesiam, quæ prior est, et propter quam Scriptura; et non e converso. Et qui ad hoc non respexerunt, impugnarunt Ecclesiam frustra, et se segregarunt ab Ecclesia. * *

* * * * *

Sed quod ministratio sacramenti credita est illis illuminate, eo modo quo ad Ecclesiæ ædificationem, scilicet Dei honorem, et animarum salutem pro loco et tempore judicaverint expedire.

H. Page 128.

Corpus Juris Canonici, Ed. Lipsiæ, 1839, p. 1151. Decreti tertia Pars de consecratione, Dist. ii. cap. xii.

Gelasius Papa Majorico et Joanni Episcopis.—Comperimus autem, quod quidam sumta tantummodo corporis sacri portione a calice sacri cruoris abstineant. Qui procul dubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.

I. Page 134.

S. Leonis Magni Opera, Ed. Lugduni, 1700, vol. i. p. 106. Sermo xli.—Resiliunt enim a sacramento salutis humanæ, et Christum Dominum nostrum, in vera naturæ nostræ carne verè

natum, vere passum, vere sepultum, et vere suscitatum esse non credunt. Et ob hoc diem salutis et lætitiæ nostræ sui jejunii mœrore condemnant. Cumque ad tegendum *infidelitatem* suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum, ne penitus latere non possint, ore indigno Christi Corpus accipiant, *sanguinem autem redemtionis* nostræ *haurire omnino declinent*. Quod ideo vestræ notum facimus sanctitati, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines et his manifestentur indiciis, et quorum deprehensa fuerit *sacrilega simulatio*, a sanctorum societate Sacerdotali autoritate pellantur.

K. Page 149.

Concil. Constant. H. Von du Hardt, tom. iv. p. 521.—Quod non obstantibus salvis conductibus Imperatorum, Regum &c. possit per judicem competentem de hæretica pravitate inquiri.

Præsens sancta synodus ex quovis salvo conducto, per Imperatorem, Reges et alios seculi principes hæreticis, vel de hæresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic a suis erroribus revocare quocunque vinculo se adstrinxerint, concesso, nullum fidei Catholicæ, vel jurisdictionis Ecclesiasticæ præjudicium generari, vel impedimentum præstari posse seu debere, declarat, quo minus dicto salvo conductu non obstante liceat judici competenti Ecclesiastico de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, et alias contra eas debite procedere, easdemque punire, quantum justitia suadebit, si suos pertinaciter recusaverint revocare errores, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii, alias non venturi. (In Lips. et Goth. additum: nec sic promittentem, cum alias fecerit, quod in ipso est, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum.)

Quo statuto sive ordinatione lecto, idem statutum fuit approbatum per dictos duos Episcopos nomine quatuor nationum, ac Reverendissimum Patrem Dominum Cardinalem Vivariensem (in Lips. Ostiensem) nomine Collegii Cardinalium per verbum *Placet*.

L. Page 152.

Huc pertinere videbitur *decretum speciale de salvo conductu Husso per Cæsarem dato*, cujus violatio excusata. Habetur in *Cod. Dorriano Vindobon.* f. 76, *a.*, sequenti quoque expresso *titulo:* De salvo conductu Hussonis.

Sacrosancta &c. Quia nonnulli nimis intelligentes, aut sinistræ intentionis, vel forsan solentes plus sapere, quam oportet, nedum *Regiæ Majestati*, sed etiam *sacro*, ut fertur, concilio, linguis maledictis detrahunt, publice et occulte *dicentes* vel innuentes, *quod salvus conductus, per* invictissimum Principem Dominum *Sigismundum Romanorum et Ungariæ*, &c. *Regem* quondam *Johanni Huss* Hæresiarchæ damnatæ memoriæ *datus, fuit contra justitiam aut honestatem indebite violatus*; cum tamen dictus Johannes Huss, fidem orthodoxam pertinaciter impugnans, se ab omni conductu et privilegio reddiderit alienum, nec aliqua sibi fides aut promissio de jure naturali, divino vel humano, fuerit in præjudicium catholicæ fidei observanda: Idcircò dicta sancta synodus præsentium tenore declarat, *dictum* invictissimum *Principem circa* prædictum quondam *Johannem Huss, non obstante memorato salvo conductu*, ex juris debito *fecisse*, quod licuit, et quod decuit Regiam Majestatem: Statuens et ordinans omnibus et singulis Christi fidelibus, cujuscumque dignitatis, gradus, præeminentiæ, conditionis, status, aut sexus existant, quod *nullus* deinceps *sacro concilio* aut *Regiæ Majestati de gestis circa* prædictum quondam *Johannem Huss* detrahat, sive quomodolibet *obloquatur*. Qui verò contrarium fecerit, tanquam fautor hæreticæ pravitatis et reus criminis læsæ Majestatis irremissibiliter puniatur.

M. Page 155.

Hosius, tom. ii. p. 359. Gulielmo Ruzio Episcopo Andegavensi Confessori Regio, epist. clxxxxviii. Rogat ut illicitum promissum de confœderatione hæreticorum a Rege factum rescindendum curet.

Non hoc ideo scribo, quod velim serenissimum Regem in primo statim in regnum ingressu, durius aliquid in Christi perduelles hæreticos statuere: facile patior, ut initio id quod absque magna Dei offensione facere poterit, ad nonnulla conniveat. Sed si quæ forte fuerit per Catholicos de jurejurando, quod præstitit, injecta mentio non solùm non molestè ferat, si minus id sibi probari palàm testati, ut id irritum esse velit, petiverint, verum et errorem suum agnoscat.

Hosii Epistolæ Henrico Valesio Poloniæ Regi, ep. cciiii. p. 367.—Si, quod pro misericordia sua Deus avertat, quod promisisti præstares, triplex jam hoc esset peccatum. Quamobrem, cum certum hoc sit juramentum non esse vinculum iniquitatis, nunquam tibi persuaderi patiaris ulla te ratione ad ea quæ promisisti præstanda teneri.

N. Page 162.

Hosius, epistol. clxxviii. p. 340.—Carolo Cardinali Lotharingio, congratulating him on the death of Admiral Coligny, whose murder was the signal for the commencement of the massacre of St. Bartholomew (see Mendham's Life of Pius V. p. 201). Deum ego precor, ut gaudium hoc tuum indies majore lætitia cumulare velit, ut lætis nuntiis quotidiè succedant lætiora, simul et illud supplex ab eo petere non intermitto quo meam quoque patriam oculis misericordiæ suæ respiciat. . . . . Subiaci iv. Sept. 1672.

O. Page 164.

The following is from a French translation of the Author's Preface to a second edition of his Eulogy :—

" Pressé par le besoin de repos à cause des incessants travaux auxquels, durant les huit derniers mois, nous avons dû nous livrer dans l'exercice du ministère ecclésiastique, et fermement résolu de ne point en entreprendre de nouveaux, nous nous étions, dans le principe, refusé à faire l'éloge de l'immortel

O'Connell. La grandeur et les circonstances tout exceptionnelles du sujet entrèrent pour beaucoup dans ce refus. O'Connell n'a pas été un homme ordinaire, mais un de ces hommes extrêmement rares que Dieu crée pour accomplir de grands desseins, d'abord connus de lui seul, et que les faits révèlent ensuite au monde.

" La gloire d'O'Connell a été d'avoir, lui seul, revendiqué la liberté religieuse et civile de sa patrie par le moyen d'une révolution pacifique, une des plus grandes dont l'histoire ait conservé la mémoire. La gloire d'O'Connell a été d'avoir fait triompher la liberté par la religion et la religion par la liberté. Or, était-il possible de rappeler ces gloires sans réveiller les ressentiments, les antipathies d'une politique ombrageuse que le seul mot de liberté effraie comme un spectre et trouble comme un remords? Etait-il possible de ne pas s'attirer la censure d'hommes tellement enfoncés dans le passé qu'ils n'ont plus d'intelligence pour voir, ni de cœur pour sentir le peu de bien qui, quoique mêlé à beaucoup de mal, se trouve dans le présent?

" Et cependant, se taire ou passer légèrement sur le titre principal qui a rendu O'Connell le plus extraordinaire, le plus admirable personnage de notre époque, n'eût-ce pas été rabaisser un des plus nobles esprits qui aient jamais paru pour la consolation et la gloire de l'humanité?

" Le censeur théologien, cet homme si éminent par sa vaste doctrine et par sa vertu, que le public admire et que le Souverain-Pontife vient de récompenser, n'a pas trouvé à censurer, dans notre Eloge, *même une virgule*. Le très savant président de la censure, qui à la science profonde de l'antiquité unit une connaissance solide, un sens exquis des choses modernes, en nous renvoyant l'Eloge, avec le *permis d'imprimer*, nous a écrit ces propres paroles: ' De même que ce fut pour moi une grande satisfaction d'approuver la bénédiction de votre dernière prédication faite à Sainte-Pierre, sans écouter les préventions de quelques personnes ou trop simples ou trop animées d'un zèle malentendu, ainsi, et beaucoup plus encore, il m'est agréable aujourd'hui d'aprouver l'Eloge funèbre que vous avez fait du

célèbre O'Connell ; parce que j'estime un tel Eloge non-seulement comme très-éloquent, mais encore comme propre à redresser beaucoup d'idées et à faire un grand bien.'

" Mais le fait est que notre doctrine nous est commune avec tous les évêques de l'Irlande, de l'Angleterre, de la France, de l'Espagne, des Amériques, avec tout ce qu'il y a aujourd'hui dans le monde de nobles intelligences et d'âmes généreuses, et nous pourrions peut-être nous élever plus haut s'il était permis de faire intervenir dans les discussions privées la plus grande et la plus sacrée des autorités. Si nous errons donc, l'erreur est honorable. Oh ! qu'il est beau d'errer en si bonne compagnie !"

The following is from a French prelate to Padre Ventura :—

" Cette grande et sainte politique, mon Révérend Père, vous l'avez formulée avec autant d'éloquence que d'exactitude dans votre belle oraison funebre d'O'Connell. Ce fut plus qu'un discours, ce funèbre événement. Votre parole puissante a allumé dans le cœur des Romains les flammes du plus pur patriotisme ; elle a réveillé dans la ville éternelle des échos depuis des siècles endormis. Mais, bénie par le Pontife suprême, elle a franchi les limites du temple et de la cité, et, des hauteurs du Vatican, elle a pu se faire entendre non seulement de l'Italie, mais du monde entier. Nous y avons tous lu le manifeste d'une pensée suprême, qui ne cherche pas à s'environner de mystères, et qui veut être éclatante comme la vérité.

" Il faut que les rares contradicteurs de Pie IX. sachent que le monde entier est contre eux, que l'opinion publique, partout où elle peut s'exprimer librement, les condamne, que la France, en particulier, sans distinction de parti, applaudit aux sages pensées qui président à votre régénération politique, *que l'épiscopat français n'a jamais été plus* unanime dans son dévouement, et que nous apercevons tous un bien immense pour la religion au bout de cette voie où Pie IX. est entré, voie déjà jonchée de haines implacables et de vieux préjugés tombés, et sur laquelle s'élève le monument plus admirable que ceux de l'ancienne Rome et où sa main de Pontife a scellé l'alliance éternelle de la religion, de l'ordre, et de la liberté.

"Vous ferez, mon Révérend Père, de cette lettre tout l'usage que vous voudrez; je ne vous exprime ma pensée et mes sentiments que pour les faire connaître.

"Agréez, mon Révérend Père, l'expression de mon sincère attachement et de mon dévoûment le plus affectueux.

"✠ Marie-Dominique-Auguste Sibour,

"*Evêque de Digne.*"

The following is from a French translation of Father Ventura's Oration on Caietanus de Thienne, pronounced at Rome in the Church of S. Andrea della Valle, August 7, 1847 :—

"Cette doctrine, je vous l'ai prêchée une autre fois et amplement exposée dans cette même chaire. (Voir *l'Eloge d'O'Connell.*) Il me reste seulement aujourd'hui à ajouter à la gloire de l'illustre patriarche dont je viens de faire l'éloge, que cette grande idée, cet artifice saintement philosophique, ce profond système qui consiste à combattre l'hérésie avec ses propres armes, à en détruire les doctrines en adoptant son langage, fut, au seizième siècle l'heureuse invention du génie de saint Gaëtan de Thienne. En effet, ce fut lui qui, dès les premières années de son apostolat, ne méditant, ne prêchant, ne défendant que la pensée d'une *réforme dans l'Eglise* et par l'Eglise, parvint à la faire accepter du Souverain-Pontife et à la faire embrasser par le concile.

"Or, quel a été le succès de ce nouveau système de traitement moral qui a conduit ces deux grands pontifes à employer les *semblables* au lieu des *contraires*, pour guérir les peuples et de l'hérésie et de la révolution? Paul III. en montant sur la chaire de St. Pierre, trouva l'hérésie aux portes de l'Italie, comme Pie IX., au moment de s'asseoir sur le trône pontifical, trouva la révolution aux portes de Rome. Eh bien! Paul, par sa sage politique, empêcha que l'Italie ne devînt la proie de l'hérésie, comme Pie, par sa généreuse charité, a empêché que Rome ne soit devenue un théâtre de révolution. Et il y a autant de scélératesse impie et d'absurdité manifeste à dire que Pie IX., par son amnistie, a excité le mouvement révolutionnaire en

Italie, qu'il y en aurait à dire que Paul III., par sa bulle de convocation du concile de Trente, suscita l'hérésie en Europe. Paul III., par cette bulle, excita, il est vrai, un grand mouvement en Europe, mais ce fut un mouvement vers une réforme vraie et sincère, œuvre de l'Eglise ; et ainsi, Pie IX., par son amnistie, a excité un grand mouvement en Italie, mais c'est un mouvement vers une liberté sage, émanant de l'autorité légitime.

" Paul, en proclamant lui-même la réforme, obtint ce magnifique succès, qu'il amena les chrétiens à désirer, à attendre, non des passions hérétiques, mais de la sagesse même de l'Eglise, la réforme religieuse, et Pie, en venant lui-même parler liberté, a obtenu le succès également grand et inattendu de persuader aux peuples de chercher, d'attendre de la justice des gouvernements, la liberté politique, et non plus des orgies clandestines de la révolte."

P. Page 177.

L'Appel comme d'Abus, &c., par M. L'Archêveque de Paris, p. 292. 2ème Partie. — De l'usage et de l'abus des opinions controversées entre les Ultramontains et les Gallicans. Napoléon n'invita pas le souverain Pontife à faire pour lui ce que faisaient les Archevêques de Rheims pour les anciens Rois de France. Il ne voulut pas avoir seulement une belle, une imposante cérémonie ; il voulut un acte, une démarche solennelle qui pût être considérée par les Catholiques comme une reconnoissance, une approbation indirecte de son droit à porter la couronne impériale. Les plus habiles Gallicans trouveraient difficilement une différence sérieuse entre la signification qu'avait le sacre de Napoléon par Pie VII., et celle que les Ultramontains attachent au pouvoir indirect du Chef de l'Eglise sur les couronnes. Ce pouvoir consiste, non à conférer l'autorité suprême, mais à déclarer que tel Souverain peut l'exercer plus utilement dans l'intérêt temporel et réligieux d'un pays. Or, le sacre étoit un déclaration aussi éclatante que la Bulle la plus claire et la plus explicite sur ce grand intérêt de la France et de son Empereur.

Q. Page 200.

Historia Ecclesiæ Evangelicæ Augustanæ Confessioni addictorum in Hungaria universe: ed. Halberstadt, 1830. p. 40.—Quod namque Cognitores, qui pro gloria Dei se propugnare simulabant, a studio suum cuique tribuendi longe fuerunt alieni, eo comprobarunt, quod quos ad subnotandas Apochas perducere non poterant ministros die quarta, rectores vero die sexta Aprilis, anno 1674, capitis damnaverint. Promulgata hacce sententia, condemnati aliquamdiu Posonii detenti, moram obtinuerunt Apochis nomina subnotandi; quod quia non fecerunt, die vicesimi Maji, quatuor reformati pastores et unus vir Evangelicis sacris addictus (M. Georgius Lani*, Scholæ Carponensis Rector), reliquorum terrendorum causa, compedibus vincti, ad arcem Posoniensem adducebantur. Cum vero neque severitas hæc optatum eventum produceret, Evangelici ab Helveticæ Confessioni Addictis separati, per Leopoldopolenses (39), Comaromienses (20), Berentsenses (5), Everhardenses (6), Sárvarenses (7), et Kapuvárenses (7), carceres, in quibus infra conditionem sceleratissimorum hominum et exsecrabilium maleficorum exagitabantur, sunt distributi. Etenim laboribus durissimis et sordidissimis onerabantur, victu tenui et exili alebantur, ab amicorum alloquio prohibebantur, baculis et fustibus cædebantur, frigore, fame, siti aliisque exquisitissimis suppliciis, quæ vel commemorare animus horret, macerabantur discruciabanturque. Afflictationibus hisce moti, viginti sex captivi in carceribus Hungariæ a fide Evangelica defecerunt. Reliquorum, a quibus id obtineri non poterat, pars, mense Martio anni 1675, per fines Moraviæ, Austriæ, Styriæ, et Carniolíæ, versus mare Adriaticum ad triremes abducebantur, pars mense Junio anno 1675, Tergestum Buccarimque et ultra deportabantur. Omnes hi in itinere immani barbarie et feritate torquebantur. Plures enim in compedibus ire jubebantur, pecuniis, quas in vestibus habebant reconditas, spoliabantur, Tergesti, quod vestes militares induere nollent, triduo

* Who published the *Hungarian Confession*. See above, p. 202.

ame premebantur. Quare nihil mirum nonnullos in itinere carnificinis his succubuisse. Quod vero ad reliquos adtinet; Buccarini decem, ejurata religione Evangelica, calamitatis suæ lenimen consecuti sunt, pauci fuga se salvarunt, aliqui a hominibus, qui miserorum sorti ingemiscebant redemti, libertati sunt restituti, alii, deprecante pro iis Electore Saxoniæ, dimissi.

* * * *

Tam iniquo fuit integro decennio, ab anno quippe 1671—1681, Nostratium in Hungaria sors, tam misera fortuna ut ipse Regis Cancellarius Hocher cui Vicarii (Repræsentantes) Nostratium die 24 Jun. 1681, casus Evangelicorum in Hungaria percensebant, commotus exclamaret; " Mirarer patientiam vestram, si decem dierum intervallo tanta mala sustinuissetis, at cum ea decem annis toleraveritis, tolerantiam vestram adtonitus stupeo."

R. Page 209.

Geschichte des Ungarschen Fluchformulars, &c. ed. Griefswald, 1823. p. 143.—Abschrift aus dem 6ten Supplement zu den Glogauischen Annalen von Joh. Samuel Tschirschnitz, An. 1790 Synd. Civit. Glogov. p. 36.—" Ex actis bey der Glogauischen Evangelischen Kirche, so von dem Herrn Pastor Posselt, 1791, mit Syndico Tschirschnitz, communicirt worden."

Beichzettel und Jurament, zu dessen Unterschrift die Bürger zu Glogau und Grünberg (vermuthlich 1628) gezwungen worden.

" Ich armer Sünder bekenne Euch, Herr Pater an Stadt Gottes und der H. Jungfrauen Mariæ und aller lieber Heiligen, dass ich so lange undt so viel Jahr (N.B. als es ohngefahr sein mag) der verfluchten verdamlichen gottlosen kätzrischen Lehre, die man Lutrisch nennet, beygewohnet, undt unter den schrecklichen Irrthums gesteket bin, auch zu ihrem grewlichen Sacrament gegangen, undt sonsten nichts als gebacken Brodt undt einen schlechten Wein aus einem Gefäss empfangen. Solchem freventlichem Irrthume undt verdamlichen Lehre entsage ich, undt verspreche nun undt nimmermehr demselben beyzuwohnen. So war mir Gott helffe undt alle Heiligen.

Articuli zu welchen die L[illegible] schwören müssen.

(1) Wir glauben alles, was die Christliche Catholische Kirche bestellen thut, es sey in der heiligen Schrift oder nicht.
(2) Wir glauben an die Intercession undt Anruffunge der heiligen.
(3) Wir glauben dass ein Purgatorium sey.
(4) Wir glauben sieben Sacrament.
(5) Wir glauben von der Jungfrauen Maria, dass sie würdiger sey grössere Ehr undt Lob als Gottes Sohn.
(6) Dass die Lutrische Lehr falsch sey.
(7) Den Kelch nicht weiter zu gebrauchen.
(8) Durch Vorbitte der heiligen sind wir verfluchte Luteraner zum waren Erkenntnuss der Christlichen Catolischen Kirchen gebracht worden.

"So weit die Annalen. Dass diese Abschrift wörtlich und buchstäblich mit dem Original übereinstimme attestire ich hiemit in fidem."—Priebus den 30 April, 1823. Worbs."

S. Page 208. 210.

Pescheck, History of the Reformation, and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia. Dresden, 1844. Translated into English; Lond. 1845. vol. ii. p. 117. (I have compared the English version with the original; and have revised and abridged it in some places from the author's work, p. 138.)—The operations of these military missionaries were not confined, as we have seen, to Bohemia; for the emperor having broken the agreement in favour of the Protestants in Silesia, which had been extorted from him by the elector of Saxony, sent his anti-reformation commissioners into that country also. * * *

The troops of Lichtenstein, under Col. de Goes, which had never been led against an enemy, but only employed in Moravia to force Evangelical Christians to the papacy, were led by a special commissioner of the emperor to Silesia; * * * on the 26th of [illegible], they took up their quarters in the neighbourhood of [illegible].

P. 121.—They spared no kind of violence in order to deprive the Evangelicals of Glogau of the privilege of religious liberty; and the town-council and the people were forced to execute a deed on the 2nd of April, 1629, testifying under their hands and seals that they had *not* been *compelled* to embrace the popish religion, but had done so from their own free choice.

P. 125.—On the 6th of December they began to collect and burn all Lutheran books and Bibles in Grünberg. The parish church remained closed four whole weeks, until at length a Jesuit came and preached the first popish sermon, and said the first mass, on the third Sunday in Advent. At first the council, the sworn men, and those belonging to the army, were obliged to partake of the communion, then the companies, with the women. The result is described by Nippe: "Great apostasy ensued in Grünberg; many were [illegible] Protestants, and on the morrow, Papists. One day they attended the Evangelical doctrine with tears, the next they went in crowds and received the confessional shrifts, upon which was written, *Fecit professionem fidei* N. N."

Ibid. vol. ii. p. 141.—Partly in order to make sure of the people gained to Romanism by persuasion or by compulsion, and partly to make a parade of the effects of their opposition to Protestantism, they required of them *public* expressions and actions testifying their renunciation, and imposed new explicit Confessions. The confession of faith, which was required of the so-called converts, had indeed been settled in the Council of Trent, in 1564; but permission was also given for many special articles to be inserted in it, according to the circumstances of the case, which is evident from the phrase, *sic et sic*, in the formulas.

We have before us a Series of *Confessions* imposed and required to be orally made by the converts in 1631; a remarkable sign of those times. A person, who allowed himself to be induced by compulsion to take the test, which he afterwards bitterly rued, brought with him a copy of what he had subscribed, on his escape to Lausitz. From this it appears that the Roman converts first declared, at the instance of the Jesuits,

"that they turned from the way of error and false heretical teaching to the way of truth, without compulsion, but from a *free* good *will*, from love to their dear superiors, and in consequence of the assiduous and pious labours and exertions of the reverend Fathers; moreover, they profess entire obedience to the pope, and that they will not read the Bible without leave, that they receive the doctrines of Purgatory, the Mass, and the Communion (*sub unâ*) in *one* kind, and reject the communion (*sub utrâque*) *in both kinds*, as heretical and execrable; that adoration ought to be paid to the Virgin Mary, Relics, and Images, and that one holy mass is more to be esteemed than one hundred Lutheran sermons. A second point in these Confessions is the curses, which commence with assertions that the Roman Catholic religion is holy, the Lutheran accursed and devilish. "[illegible] curse all who have brought us up in the [illegible]" See Pescheck, ii. p. 155.

Then follows an oath in which the converts swear no longer to acknowledge *utraquism;* to oppose every where the Evangelical doctrine; in no wise to turn back from the papal creed; to warn their children against the former; *always to flee the Cup and the Bible* (Kelch und Bibel stets zu meiden). The conclusion will show how eager the converters were to be able to give proofs to their superiors that all had been done *without compulsion*. It is there repeated: "We swear that we with a good will, good understanding, good conscience, after a long, ardent desire; *without compulsion*, but rather with a free will, not for the sake of pleasing any one, nor from any interested motive, do renounce and execrate the Evangelical doctrine in which we were born and bred, and gladly embrace the Catholic religion, as the only one which bringeth salvation" (die allein seligmachende). A fourth point was the Confirmation (die Bestätigung); in which, in order to show that they had renounced utraquism, they symbolically trampled upon the Cup, and confessed their sin; then they received shrift. The following is the formula of the confession:—"I, poor and miserable sinner, acknowledge and confess to you, my reverend confessor, in the place of God and the blessed Virgin Mary, and all saints,

that I have for a long time held the heretical doctrine, and have lived in great error, and gone likewise to the heretical sacrament*, have eaten bad bread, and drunken bad wine. But now will I abstain from it in all my future life, and curse and persecute it, and never more consent to it. So help me God, and the immaculate Virgin Mary and all the saints."—Pescheck, ii. p. 158. * * * *

That the *Jesuits* used these formulas is nothing wonderful, since they were perfect masters in the work of anti-reformation. To confirm the truth of the accounts of such proceedings, we shall adduce from other sources the following description of the papal church-penance for converts†:—"The convert is led from the place of confinement to the appointed church, as a heinous sinner, with a black-coloured candle in his hand, and in the presence of many hundreds of spectators. He is then placed before the great altar, and there upon his knees obliged to abjure his heresy with *many very severe self-reproaches and invectives*, which are dictated to him by the priest. He is also required to kick away with his feet a wooden Cup, and to promise fidelity to the so-called true Roman Catholic religion. Sometimes the convert is scourged upon his bare shoulders by a priest, and is thus made to suffer for his sin of heresy, and deterred from future apostasy. Finally, he is to go to confession without delay, and to take the communion *sub unâ*, as a pledge, that he will not fall again into the heinous sin of apostasy. Many relate this who were long kept in prison, till they consented to make this abjuration: they purchased the freedom of their persons by selling their conscience; and were obliged to curse the truth they had once embraced, and even their own *parents*."

* At Reisse, in Silesia, it was declared from the pulpit, that whoever took the Sacrament with the Evangelicals in both kinds received the very devil himself.—Apology, 240.

† From Salig's History of the Augsburg Confession, p. 895—897. Note E e.

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

Lately Published,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

I.

LETTERS to M. GONDON,
Author of "Mouvement Religieux en Angleterre," "Conversion Cent cinquante Ministres Anglicans," &c. &c. &c., on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome, both in Religion and Polity.
Second Edition. Price 8s. 6d.

II.

A DIARY in FRANCE;
Mainly on Topics concerning Education and the Church.
Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.

III.

The SAME; Translated into French.
Price 6s. 6d.

IV.

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS;
Or, Instruction for the Young Student concerning the Church, and the English Branch of it.
Fifth Edition. Price 8s. 6d.

V.

The SAME; in Modern Greek,
For the use of Travellers in Greece and the Levant.
Price 6s.

RIVINGTONS,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 17 February, 2016